

4225

bb 46

R. Flexman

THE CALM

DEFENCE

OF THE

DEITY

OF

JESUS CHRIST,

Continued and Maintain'd;

AGAINST

The Reasonings and Exceptions of  
the Author of the LETTER to a  
DISSENTER in *Exeter*:

BEING

A REPLY to his *Plain Christianity De-*  
*fended*, Third and Fourth Parts.

---

By JOHN MOORE,  
of *Tiverton*.

---

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN CLARK, at the Bible and Crown  
in the Poultry, near Cheapfide. M.DCC.XXI.

Price 1 s. 6 d.

1398

THE CALM  
 DEFENCE  
 OF THE  
 DEFILITY  
 OF  
 JESUS CHRIST



The Reasonings and Exceptions of  
 the Author of the LETTER to a  
 DISSENTER in EXETER;

BEING

A REPLY to his Plain Christianity De-  
 fended, Third and Fourth Parts.

By JOHN MOORE,  
 of Tiverton.

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN CLARK, at the Bible and Crown  
 in the Strand, near Chancery. MDCCLXXII.

Price 1 s. 6 d.





The C A L M  
D E F E N C E  
Of the D E I T Y of  
**J E S U S C H R I S T**  
Continued & Maintained, &c.

S I R,



**I**F I had not thought the Interest of Religion nearly concerned in the late Disputes about the Deity of our Blessed Lord *Jesus*, I should hardly have been drawn out of my Retirement, and from more delightful Work, into the Field of Controversy, which I have always had an aversion to: especially observing with what uncharitable Heats, and ungenteel Artifices, it is wont to be managed. Some concurring Circumstances of Providence overruled, and led me into the Debate; which I was willing to carry on with such Calmness, and fair Methods, as become the Defenders of Truth; and which I never found to be a real Disadvantage or

B Pre-

Prejudice to it : whatever Diversion and Entertainment, angry Reflections and ill-natur'd Turns of Wit may give to corrupt Minds, that have little value or relish for it. Methinks it should be indifferent to the Wise and Considerate, in what way we must be saved ; and that we should be prepared to make impartial Enquiries into the Will of God about it, without being prepossessed in favour of an Opinion, merely because it had the Advantage of being first in the Mind, or comes with the flattering Air of Wit or Novelty. But how unkind and disingenuous, by Slander, or sly Insinuations, to seek the Ruin of his Reputation, or to expose him to Scorn and Contempt, who differs in Opinion from me, and merely upon this account ? If that be the sole Ground of Quarrel, he has on his part the same reason to be angry with me. The Interest of Truth is not serv'd or promoted by Methods of Injury and Provocation ; but secure of its Cause and intrinsic Worth, attempts to make its Conquests by fair and candid Proposals, and the Force of strong and convictive Proof.

I HOPE therefore I shall be excus'd, if I venture not upon those Indecencies and Terms of Reproach, which the common way of Controversy may seem to warrant, and some take for an Ornament in their Writings. It may satisfy the Judicious, without making Reprizals of that kind, to examine and give a just Answer to the Exceptions that have been made to my Defence of the Deity of Christ, in a Book plausibly entitled, \* *Plain Christianity defended, 3d and 4th parts.* The Gentleman it seems intended to spirit up this Defence of himself, under Disguise, without *appearing as the Author of the Letter.* A piece of Management thought not improper for the Advantage of the Cause. Nor is it less Artifice, to

---

\* PL. Chr. p 48, 52.

set out the receiv'd Doctrine of the Trinity as of  
 \* *abstruse* Speculation, and pass his own upon the  
 Unwary, under the Notion of *plain Christianity*.  
 Somewhat strange! that the Generality of learned  
 and serious Christians should upon the most diligent  
 Search, be yet so little apprized of this, as to re-  
 ject it as unscriptural and absurd, and still condemn  
 it as a dangerous Error! The common Faith has  
 hitherto stood the tryal of Opposition. Neither  
 Wit nor Industry, Power or Policy, Craft or Learn-  
 ing, have been wanting in such as have set them-  
 selves against it. And tho' sometimes it has been  
 disgraced and oppressed, yet it has again soon re-  
 covered its Lustre and Credit, and maintained its  
 Ground against Argument and Assault. Nor is it  
 a small Ease and Satisfaction to my Mind, amidst  
 Controversies and Disputes, after severer Enquiries,  
 to find my Belief consonant to that of the far great-  
 est part of Christians, who constantly professed and  
 contended for this Doctrine, bottom'd their Hope  
 and Comfort upon it, regulated their Worship and  
 Practice by it, and went to Heaven with Triumph  
 and Assurance. As for the *Suppositions of good Men*  
*about this matter*, I see no reason to slight, or have  
 them in contempt, tho' I build not my Faith upon  
 them. And tho' some Doctrines of the greatest Im-  
 portance, such as the Resurrection, and even Crea-  
 tion, as well as that of the Trinity, be of difficult  
 Explication; this can't be admitted as a sufficient  
 Argument against 'em, any more than against many  
 things in Nature which are as unintelligible to us.  
 Besides, it may be thought but reasonable and mo-  
 dest in them that urge this, as a grand Objection  
 against the Faith generally professed, first to clear  
 their own Scheme of the apparent Absurdities it is  
 chargeable with.

---

\* Let. p. 3.



WHEREAS our Author \* *wishes that all Writers upon this Controversy would endeavour to serve the Design of Charity, which he pretends to promote*; he has my hearty Concurrence: nor would it have been any Impeachment of his Prudence, or Inconsistency with the Design, to have forborn the giving unfair Turns to innocent Expressions, and catching at Occasions of uncharitable Censures.

I STILL think it little for the Credit of the Opinions of late revived, that Men of Learning, who shew a Fondness for them, find it necessary in the Defence, to employ all the Quirks of Wit, and Arts of Criticism they are Masters of, to draw the Scriptures into a seeming Compliance. Yet it cannot be amiss, so far to comport with the Example, as to manifest of how little Service they are to the Cause they are used for the Support of. Nor need it be marked as a \* *Quirk of the Defender's Wit*, to say that it gave him not a very favourable Opinion of Arianism, to find Mr. *Whiston* so little to rely upon Scripture-Proof, as to labour with the Expence of so much Pains and Learning, to bring in so many spurious, suspected, or adulterate Works of ignorant Antiquity, to be received as inspired Writings of equal Authority with the Holy Scriptures, considering what Advantage is hereby given to the Enemies of Revealed Religion; whenas he did not in the least suggest, that *the Letter was to be suspected of agreeing with him in these Notions*.

WHAT was offer'd in the || Defence to shew the Peoples undoubted Right, to be satisfy'd in the Ministers, they statedly communicate with as found in the Faith, and not to run a needless hazard of being drawn into Errors greatly to their prejudice, under the Conduct of such as are justly suppos'd to be in

---

\* Pl. Chr. p. 4.

† Pl. Chr. p. 5

|| Pl. Chr. p. 6.

them; the Author acknowledges *† to be true, upon supposition of Peoples being convinc'd of their running a great hazard: but then, says he, the Query is, whether Christians can have any sufficient reason to apprehend, they shall run such a hazard in the Case before us?* To which I answer, That they are obliged to act according to their present Light and Convictions, and not according to his Sense and Opinion in the Case, who is pleased to suppose that they cannot have a sufficient reason for such Apprehension. But why should he not in Charity suppose, that they had used honest Endeavours, and proper Means, in their Station and Circumstances, as well as himself, and those of his side, to be rightly inform'd, and to arrive at the Knowledge of the Truth? Or why should they be suspected of Insincerity, tho' they take not his Judgment to be the Standard of their Opinion and Practice, who thinks they cannot have sufficient reason?

If some have acted with Weakness, and Indiscretion, in breaking Communion with particular Persons or Churches, upon smaller Matters, or Niceties in Controversy; it follows not, that the Denial of Christ's proper Divinity, which so nearly affects Christian Worship, may not be a sufficient Cause to cease stated Communion with a Minister, in the opinion of sober and sincere Christians: which is far from being applicable (justly) to every controverted Point, (however Liberty of Conscience ought not to be infring'd, even in the Weaker and less Judicious; or Imposition allow'd under pretence of Unity or external Uniformity, or wanting better Information.) Nor need this presently be condemn'd as *breaking the Communion of the Church*; or it be thought a Crime or Absurdity, for Persons of so different Apprehensions, to worship in different Assemblies, provided they do not uncharitably censure, much less attempt to persecute each

---

\* Pl. Chr. p. 5.

other. A Man may highly value, and live in the Communion of the Church, altho' for just Reasons he judge it not lawful, or expedient, to settle in the Communion of this or the other particular Church. It is true, that the Communion of the Church ought not to be stated upon other Terms, than what Christ has appointed and made necessary, who is the sole Lord of it. But as this is well enough consistent with the Right that every Man, and every Christian Society, has to judge for themselves; so it no way interferes with, or abridges, the Liberty which every Man has, to chuse, and fix under the Ministry he thinks in his Conscience, upon mature Consideration, to be most for his Edification, Safety, and Comfort. Nor is there any reason to fear, that the prudent Exercise of this Liberty will *be the ready way to crumble the Christian Church into Factions and Parties*, where no Tricks or factious Methods are used to spread private Opinions, or uncharitable Attempts made for mutual Impositions.

OUR Author then need not be so angry at my apprehending, that the Letter seem'd to threaten, that such as encouraged People in their Doubts (about *communicating* with Ministers thought to be fallen into dangerous Errors) might *find themselves affected with the Consequences*, when *Arians*, or others from among themselves, divided in their Sentiments, having formed their Party, might take the same measures, and in their turn seek to crush their Opponents. If it seemed to me as well as some others to have this Aspect, where is the Crime? That Methods of Violence and Persecution were used by the *Arians* of old, when they got the upper hand, and the favour of the Civil Powers, is not deny'd. And tho' it be said, that the *reputed Orthodox began*, that could not, by the Rules of Charity, justify the severe Reprizals, which indeed, as he observes, were on both sides *disgraceful to the Religion they professed*. There will be less



less room for Apprehension, and Pretences to Charity will find more credit, if even under supposed Provocations, contemptuous Reflections be forborn, and a Christian Temper maintain'd; if instead of bitter Resentments, and summoning the Horrors of a *Spanish Inquisition* to create Animosity and fix a frightful Idea, proper and seasonable Endeavours be used, to allay Passions and intemperate Hearts.

Tho this Gentleman confesses that I *frankly disclaim Persecution*, yet he will needs harbour some *Jealousy* of me, because I *disclaimed not what was done at Exeter to Mr. Hallet and Mr. Pierce as Persecution*: but I hope he'll excuse me from divining; a little Charity would have eas'd him of the unkind *Jealousy*, considering that the Defence was gone for the Press before their Ejection. Nor have I any reason to apprehend *the World's Censure*, which he has the Civility to prompt, for my share and conduct in the Advice given to the Gentlemen of *Exeter*; or should be ashamed to give the World account of it upon just and necessary Occasion.

WHEN I argue for the Liberty of Christians to judge for themselves, what Ministry to sit under, \* without being confin'd to such as agree not with them in the Object and Manner of Worship, but willing to join in so solemn a Part of Worship as Prayer, where their Minds may be easy, and their Affections united; he says, † *There are two Mistakes here of the Point in hand*: (1.) *In supposing the Letter would have Men confine themselves to a particular Ministry*; whereas it pleads for their not confining themselves, and that they should be ready to attend the Ministry of any, who in the main order their Worship according to the Scriptures. (2.) *In going upon the supposition of Peoples being uneasy*; whereas the Design of that part of the Letter, is to shew them they have no reason to be uneasy. For if the

\* Def. p. 7.

† Pl. Chr. p. 8.

*Worship be directed to the Father thro' the Son, this is what all Christians may well be easy with.* I answer, He either mistakes the Drift of my Discourse, or clouds the matter in Ambiguity. As to the first, If by *being ready to attend a Ministry* he mean only an *Occasional Attendance*, he'll find my Reasoning not directly levelled against that; but if he intends, what I express'd, *statedly to communicate*, the Case is clear, that if Persons happen to be under a Ministry, which is become justly suspected to 'em, and judge it will be dangerous, and to their disadvantage to *settle under it*, they may desire to be excused from running a *needleless hazard*, and may prefer such an one, as they can with more Safety and Comfort attend upon, as my words are, implying manifestly, that to be barr'd, or not allow'd such a Liberty, would be an injurious Confinement. As to the other Point; The *Uneasiness* does not arise from the Worship's being directed to the Father thro' the Son; nor does such a general Expression suffice to make *easy*, (in the mouth of a Minister, who is known to deny the true and proper Deity of Christ, and therefore) suppos'd by the Unsatisfy'd, not to be used in the true and intended Sense of Scripture, but in a Sense very injurious to his Honour. Nor can Persons be easy or safe in preferring, and chusing statedly to join in a Communion, where tho' Worship is professed to be directed to the Father thro' the Son; yet that Worship which they believe in their Consciences is due and necessary, and required by the Word of God, to be directed immediately to Jesus Christ, is denied, refused, or not given. The one, tho' lawful and the more ordinary way of Worship, must not exclude, or be thought sufficient without the other, since both are enjoin'd, and to be practis'd in the Assemblies of Christians.

I pass, as unconcern'd in, the \* Reflections our

---

\* Pl. Chr. p. 9.

Author makes upon that Management and Way of Writing, which he appears so well acquainted with, and which I think foreign to the Argument. Nor was it very candid in him to insinuate that we *thought to carry the Cause by calling Men Arians, and charging them with damnable Heresies*, without giving proof or instances of this in the Defence, whatever occasion was offer'd.

I WAS not indeed forward to determine what is absolutely fundamental, or absolutely necessary to Salvation, supposing with \* *Mr. Chillingworth*, 'That may be sufficiently declared to one (all things consider'd) which (all things consider'd) to another is not sufficiently declared. And consequently that may be fundamental and necessary to one, which to another is not so. Which Variety of Circumstances makes it impossible to set down an exact Catalogue of Fundamentals.' Nor was it for me to determine, what Allowances a gracious God may make, for the different Circumstances and Prejudices of Men, who use some honest Means for Information, tho' they fall into Error. But our Author's Jealousy grows, and prompts Expostulation upon this. *Why does he think we use only some honest Means, and that his own side are the only Men who use all honest Means?* And what if I charitably think that favourable Allowances will be made, where *some* honest Means are used, tho not *all*? I know of no great harm in the Supposition on the part of Sincerity, tho' there be still the same difference between Truth and Error, and God is the alone Judge of the allowances to be made, who is not governed by our measures. Nor do I pretend to know by whom *all Means* are employ'd, tho' if some Instances be consider'd, there will possibly appear no extraordinary reason to *boast*.

I AM still of the mind, that a Difference in the great Articles of Faith, cannot in just Estimate be

\* *Chillingw. Safe Way, p. 103.*



an harmless, or mere *Difference in Opinion*. As a wicked Life is certainly to be condemn'd ; so are Opinions that subvert the Faith, without which we can expect but little Holiness. If the denying the Resurrection of the Body is to be esteem'd of such a nature and tendency ; the denying the Deity of Christ may possibly be thought not of less consequence, as sensibly affecting the Vitals of Religion, or the Life and Hope and Worship of Christians, as such. But says the Author, *If he thinks his Notions main Articles of the Christian Faith, 'tis much he cannot set them down in plain Scripture-Assertions*. Which he is pleas'd again and again to suggest ; but without just reason. For without advancing any private Notions of my own under such a Character, the great Articles I plead for and defend, I can and often do set down in plain Scripture Expressions ; (*viz.*) ' That the Lord our God is ' one Jehovah, that besides him there is no other God ; ' that as the Father is true God, so the Son also is ' true God, over all blessed for ever.' As for the Consequence, it may be securely left to form itself, and appears in our Lord's Assertion, *I and my Father are one*.

WHAT intemperate Heats and Passions appear'd, on either side of the Controversy, I was free to condemn, and shew my dislike of, and should have been surpriz'd at the Author's Assurance, in wholly acquitting his Party, if I had not been accustomed to his manner. He does not tell us, that he was present at the Debates ; but says, *By all the Accounts I have received, they are perfectly innocent* : subjoining this only reason, *For I cannot bear that they ever judge any Man's Estate for his Opinion*. As if Men might not be guilty of Heats and Indecencies, notwithstanding this whether true or no. But when he adds, *that by an artful and malicious Representation I would' have them to appear guilty*, I am at a loss for the Candour, or Innocence of the Charge. The Facts were plain enough

( II )

enough before many Witnesses to justify the Representation; and as for the Malice of it, I am secure and perfectly unconcern'd, and scorn to retort the uncharitable Censure.

THO' I yet see no reason to doubt that the Doctrine we maintain, was the Belief of the best, and most antient Churches, and esteemed a main Article of Christian Religion in the Ages preceding the Council of *Nice*, I thought myself not concern'd to engage in the proof of this, in answer to the Letter. It has been formerly and of late done by Persons of great Abilities and Learning: nor is it a small pleasure to perceive an Harmony and Concurrence in the same Faith. But being confessedly a matter of Revelation, I am content to seek it in the Holy Scriptures, and to leave the Decision of the Controversy to their Sentence.

WE may then attend our Author's Remarks on what I said *p. 10.* Here, with that great Master of Reason \* *ABp Tillotson*, I fix my foot; That there are three Differences in the Deity, which the Scripture speaks of by the Names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and every where speaks of them as we use to do of three distinct Persons: And therefore see no reason why in this Argument we should nicely abstain from using the word *Person*, † nor can see any just reason to quarrel at this Term.

UPON this he summons up some of his strongest and most popular Reasons grounded upon the Notion of Personality, which he would have to be apply'd to the Divine Three, in the same manner as to us Men, and thinks to load the common Faith with inextricable Difficulties on this account. *The same Arguments*, says he, *that evidence these to be three distinct Persons, do as fully evidence them to be three distinct Beings.*——*If he thinks he can make a difference here, I*

\* Works in fol. *p. 547.*

† Ibid. *p. 589.*

would desire him to let me know what that difference is. If he talks of Persons in a different Sense from that in which we always use the word, he ought clearly to define it.—I use the word Persons in speaking of this matter, just as I do when I speak of any Persons. I ans<sup>r</sup>. He is at liberty to do so, and to abound in his own Sense ; but that his Sense should be made a Standard for the rest of the Christian World, will not be so easily agreed. He well knows the common Sentiment has been stated upon a somewhat different foot ; and that those, who have equally oppos'd the *Sabellian* and *Arian* Schemes, have not spoken of *Persons* in this matter, just as they do of any Persons. But while they have consider'd the distinct personal Characters, Relations, and Offices of Father, Son, and Spirit, as represented in Scripture, against the *Sabellians*, have as carefully guarded against the *Arian* Inference, that therefore they are three real different Beings, or Substances. A middle way has been generally taken by the Learned as the true Scripture-Account, apprehending a certain Distinction among the Divine Persons, and not that they are but three different Names, and yet believing them to be one in Nature and Perfection, as well as in Affection and Consent.

THE truth is, the word *Being* seems to be used ambiguously in this Debate, while some take it in a more general Sense, as signifying any thing that hath Existence, and is the Subject of certain Modes and Predications ; and others confine it to a stricter, so as to denote a real and separate Substance. Hence if Personality be allow'd to import *Intelligent Being*, these latter presently infer, that *Persons* must signify different Substances ; and because among us Men three Persons are three several Substances, therefore the Divine Persons must be several and divided Substances. But we can't be always safe in reasoning from what we experience in our Nature, to what must be in the Divine. That which creates difficulty in



in this matter seems to be, that we can carry our Conceptions, and Reasonings, no farther than we have Ideas to support them. Now these are agreed to arise either from Sensation or Reflection; nor are we capable of forming any other, than what one or both of these do furnish us with. There are things in Heaven, which yet appear not to us, which have not enter'd into the Heart of Man. When St. Paul had been there in Spirit, he could not utter or express 'em by any words in use among us on Earth, which marks the Conceptions we have of what is within us, or from without solicits and affects our Sense. Our Knowledge here is very narrow, accommodated to the Circumstances of our present State, and can't be extended beyond the Reach of our present Ideas: how easily therefore may we mistake, when we venture to pronounce what is, or is not, competent to the Divine Nature, so infinitely above our own? And what Presumption to determine, that 'tis impossible there should be in it, what may be a sufficient ground for such Distinctions, as the Scriptures mention; tho' Father, Son, and Spirit may be one in Substance, and not three separate Substances as three Men are?

OUR present Conceptions are form'd upon our Experience, nor are we so well acquainted with the Nature of God, as to be able to frame a just Idea of all that is in it, or belongs to it. Revelation itself gives us no new Ideas, amidst the great Discoveries it makes; but suiting itself to our present Capacity, and Condition, is content to let us have Notices of what as yet is incomprehensible to us. \* Among finite Beings it is not to be expected, because not possible, to find any exact Resemblance of that which is infinite, and consequently is incomprehensible; because whatever is infinite, is for that

\* Tillotson's Works fol. p. 530.

‘ reason incomprehensible by a finite Understanding ;  
 ‘ which is too short and shallow to measure that  
 ‘ which is infinite : and whoever attempts it, will  
 ‘ soon find himself out of his Depth. \* And that it  
 ‘ ought not to offend us, that these Differences in  
 ‘ the Deity are incomprehensible by our finite Un-  
 ‘ derstandings, because the divine Nature itself is so ;  
 ‘ and yet the Belief of it is the Foundation of all  
 ‘ Religion.’

IF in our Souls, the only Nature within our Knowledge, that bears the Image of the Divine, we find the distinct Faculties of vital Power, Understanding, and Will, the former operating and exerting itself in and by the other ; yet as we cannot hence conclude, that there are such Faculties properly and formally in God, so nor that ’tis impossible there should be some Differences in the Deity, analogous to those Powers in us, which these are but a Shadow, and faint Resemblance of, and which, in that infinitely superior Nature, may be much more considerable, yet well consistent with the Unity thereof.

THAT which the Scripture sets forth with greatest Plainness, and which we may believe without *puzzling* ourselves about the *manner*, is, that there is but one only true and living God ; that as the Father is God, so the Son is God, that the proper Characters of Deity belong also to him ; that yet they are to be consider’d as distinct, and sustaining different Relations. And in reference to this, we need not nicely abstain from the Word *Person*, tho’ the Scripture appear not directly to use it ; and tho’ it be not intended to signify to the full, and in all respects, what *Person*, in relation to Men, doth ; as few of those things predicated of Men, when applied to God, do. And we may allow, all that is

---

\* Tillotson’s Works fol. p. 590.

wont to be comprized in the Notion of Person, with reference to the Father, Son, and Spirit, so far as is consistent with their being one in Substance and Perfection. But if because they are spoken of as distinct Persons, we must take them to be separate Substances, they must be different Gods, contrary to Reason and the plainest Revelation. † Mr. Nelson's learned Friend observes, ' That the Notion of a *Person* and an *intelligent Being*, in relation to the Creatures, is the same, because each such *intelligent Being* is supposed to have but one *Subsistence*— But the Notion of a *Person* and an *intelligent Being*, in relation to *God*, is not the same, neither can they be reciprocally spoken the one of the other; for tho' each divine *Person* by himself is an *intelligent Being*, yet the divine *intelligent Being* is not one *Person* only; because *God*, who is that divine *intelligent Being*, is represented to us in Scripture, as having not one *Subsistence* only, but a *Plurality* of *Subsistences*: so that the Notion of a *Plurality* of *Subsistences* enters into the Idea of *God*, or the divine *intelligent Being*.

BUT our Author says, \* *I never find in all the Scripture, that the word God, in the singular Number, is put to express a complex Notion of more Persons than one.* I answer; I know not whether I well understand his Meaning about a *complex Notion*; but do think, that in many places, both of the Old and New Testament, the word *God* does fairly signify and comprize the Persons both of Father and Son: For instance, I see not why in *Gen. i. 1.* where 'tis said, *In the Beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth;* the *Word* that was in the Beginning, and was *God*, should not be understood to be included; by whom all things were created that are in Heaven and in Earth, and without whom, was not any thing made,

† True Script. Doct. part 2. p. 4.

\* Pl. Chr. p. 12.

that



that was made; 1 *John* i. 3. of whom 'tis said, *Heb.* i. 10. *And thou, Lord, in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth; and the Heavens are the Work of thy Hands.* Nor will it, I suppose, be objected, that *Elohim* is a Word of the plural Number, which is joined with a Verb of the singular, since those who are against a Plurality of Persons as denoted, would construct it singularly; and it is known, that what we render Creator, *Eccl.* xii. 1. is [אֱלֹהֵי בְרִיאָה] *thy Creators*, in the *Hebrew*: and what we render *Maker* in *Isa* liv. 5. and *Psal.* cxlix. 2. is *Makers* in the *Hebrew*; tho' the same Word be often apply'd to God in the Singular; as *Psal.* xcv. 6. *Isa.* li. 13, &c. So that tho' in *Isa* xlv. 24. *Jehovah* is said to make all things, to stretch forth the Heavens *alone*, and spread ~~forth~~<sup>abroad</sup> the Earth *by himself*, this excludes not the Word that was in the Beginning with him, but probably intimates a Plurality of Persons creating; yet those Persons are but one Creator, because they are but one God, have but one Deity, and absolute divine Power by which they create, jointly concurring, or the same in all Operations *ad extra*. See also *Gen.* i. 26. chap. iii. 22. \* *Isa* vi. 1,—8.

Another Instance may be, *Rom.* xiv. 11, 12. Every Tongue shall confess to God; so then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God; alledged as a Proof, that we shall all stand before the Judgment-seat of *Christ*, † *ver.* 10. the God in Unity with the Father, to whom every Knee must bow, and every Tongue confess, from *Isa.* xlv. 23. It is of a distinct Consideration, and alters not the Case, that Judgment is committed unto the Son of Man by Grant and Donation, (as will after be shown) since if this Mediator be not God manifested in Flesh,

\* Pl. Chr. p. 16.

† *Nelf.* True Script. Doct. p. 205.

*Heb.* God as well as Man, the Assertion would not be clear, nor the Proof just.

*d the* WHEREAS our Author \* *puts it to me, whether I*  
*Work* think the Scheme of the Archbishop (of the Father's being  
 ected, the Fountain of the Deity) can possibly be defended:  
 which He is not ignorant, that it has been defended by  
 those many of great Judgment and Learning, and † that  
 ot, it is spoken in a rhetorical and popular way, of which  
 that there may be a fair and candid Interpretation. But  
 אה ] my Defence being not concerned directly in it, I see  
 nder no occasion here for insisting upon it.

*rs in* NOR do I see much reason to follow him, in the  
*d to* Remarks he is pleased to make, upon some of those  
*&c.* Texts of Scripture I mention'd for the Deity of  
 make Christ, amidst a multitude and variety collected by  
 and Mr. Mayo, and others. It was the Defence of this  
 s not that I had undertaken in answer to his Letter, which  
 , but I was content to consider. If I had gone upon a  
 ting; fuller, and more general Proof, he might reasonably  
 e they suppose, I should have taken another Method, and  
 olute insisted on those Texts, upon which the clearest and  
 incur- strongest Arguments might be built. And it was  
 . See popular enough in him, to except against some of  
 Every more doubtful Interpretation, upon which no stress  
 ne of was intended to be laid, or Doctrine to be built, but  
 dged in conjunction with others more plain and certain.

Judg- I THEREFORE observed ||, to open the way to  
 with the intended Defence, that it cannot but be acknow-  
 , and ledged, that there are numerous, and, to appearance,  
 of a very plain Texts of Scripture alledg'd for the Proof  
 that of Christ's Deity, tho' the Sense of those Texts be  
 n by disputed. And farther |||, that there is a great diffe-

since \* Pl. Chr. p. 12.

flesh, † Placeus takes notice of Crellius. Vexat id quod à quibus-  
 dam è nostris oratoriè & figuratè dictum est, Patrem esse  
 Fontem Divinitatis—Hoc est quod nos simpliciter et magis  
 propriè dicere solemus, Filium et Spiritum S. esse à Patre.

Disput. par. 3. p. 29.

|| Calm Def. p. 11.

||| Ibid. p. 16.



rence between the conjunct Force and Evidence of many Texts of Scripture together, which mutually enlighten and support one another, in the Testimony they give to an important Truth ; and the Evidence of some single Passages, arbitrarily selected, and separately consider'd.

HE might have forborn his Wonder, and critical Remark upon the Expression, he is said to be possessed by the Lord, *Prov. viii. 22.* the *in*, by the Error of the Press only, being put for *by*. Nor was I ignorant of the trouble, which the Septuagint Translation, in use among the *Greeks*, gave some of old, by rendring it, *he created me*, departing manifestly from the Sense and Import of the original *Hebrew*, which few of them understood. And yet even [ἐκ]ινσε if not by the fault of Transcribers, put for [ἐκ]ινσε or ἐκτίσας] was thought capable of another Sense; and the LXXII in *Zach. xiii. 5.* render [הַקִּיבִי] the same word in a different Conjugation, signifying *possidere me fecit*, [ἐγέννησέν με] *begat me*. But tho the Antients had this Translation in use before the fourth Century, I can no way comprehend, how *this is a certain Evidence, that the Doctrine we defend, was not then esteem'd a main Article of the Christian Faith* ; as he with so much assurance asserts.

As to Christ's being called, *The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father*, *Isa. ix. 6.* says he, *I may well refer him to Mr. Gataker in the Assembly's Annotations, which according to him should be render'd, A Mighty God, as we readily grant he is : The Father of Eternity, that is, the Author of Eternal Life.* I might securely pass it by, but for the sake of the Reader, and the Learned Mr. Gataker, who seem not to be candidly dealt with, I should be glad, that the Annotations might be consulted ; where, upon this Text, that judicious Commentator does both assert and prove the Eternal Deity of Christ, against those among Jews and Christians, that would lower and divert the Sense. Unto



us a Child is born; says he, ' Even the Messias, the Eternal Son of the Eternal Father. A Child at his Birth in regard of his human Nature, tho' the Son of God from Eternity in regard of his Deity.' Nor does he affirm it *should*, tho' he allows it *may* be render'd, *A mighty God*: but adds, that ' the word [El] howsoever in the plural Number some once or twice it may signify *Great ones*; yet in the singular Number, it is never used, but for God; and with the Adjection *Great and Mighty God*, the Title fitteth well to Christ, who hath all the Names of Deity given to him in Scripture;' as he there enumerates, and in this respect (not in the *Socinian* or *Arian* Sense) the Author of Eternal Life.

FOR *Rom. xiv. 11.* it has been already taken notice of, *p. 16.* and will be further afterwards. He to whom every Tongue must confess, or swear, is God, or *Jehovah*. Compare *Isa. xlv. 21, 23.*

UPON my suggesting, that where Christ is called the beginning [*ה' אֵלֶּיךָ*] might be render'd, the Efficient Cause, of the Creation of God; \* our Author thinks it for his purpose to make an Harangue, as if I went to *build a Doctrine upon a doubtful Interpretation*, which I intended not to do; and then labours to set out the Strength of the *Arian* Argument hence, to prove that Christ is a Creature, which it may be soon enough to consider, when he sees fit openly to espouse, and declare for it. And tho' he says, 'Tis indeed one of the strongest Texts in favour of that Notion; yet but supposing it fairly capable of the Sense I offer'd, it appears not to be *unanswerable*, whether it convince them or no, who having taken up an Opinion, are resolv'd to maintain it. ABp Tillotson says, '† It is very probable, that the Son of God calls himself, *the Beginning of the Creation of God*, meaning by it, as the Philosophers most frequently use the

\* Pl. Chr. p. 14.

† Fol. p. 529.

‘ word ἀρχή, the *Principle*, or *Efficient Cause* of the  
 ‘ Creation. And so we find the same word, which  
 ‘ our Translation renders *the Beginning*, used toge-  
 ‘ ther with the word *First-born*, as if they were of  
 ‘ the same importance; \* *The Beginning and First-born*  
 ‘ *from the Dead*, that is, the *Principle and Efficient*  
 ‘ *Cause of the Resurrection of the Dead.*’

I KNOW not why I might *not make use of* Tit. ii.  
 13. The glorious appearing of the Great God and  
 our Saviour Jesus Christ, *till I had answer'd what*  
*Dr. Clark says of it*; when there was no occasion then  
 of having his Reasons under consideration, nor was I  
 convinc'd by them of a Misapplication of the Text.  
 For to say, that the Title of *great God* is appropriate  
 to the Person of the Father, and belongs not to the  
 Son, is to suppose what is neither proved nor will be  
 granted. And besides that there being no Article be-  
 fore [ὁ ὢν] both Titles of *great God* and *Saviour*,  
 according to Grammatical Construction (which *Dr.*  
*Clark* allows) seem to belong equally to the same  
 Subject; the [ἐπιφάνεια] *Appearance* is still spoken in  
 Scripture of Jesus Christ, and not of the Father:  
 And also what follows, *ver. 14.* is directly and cur-  
 rently spoken of Christ, without a word of the Fa-  
 ther.

WHEREAS the Author thinks, 'tis plain that Christ  
 was not the same God with the Father, because he, in his  
 own Person, was never seen, never manifested to any Man.  
 He takes for granted what he knows is deny'd, that  
 he can't be the same God, except he be the same  
 Person. Tho' God be not manifested in the Person  
 of the Father, this hinders not but he may in the  
 Person of the Son.

WHEN God is said † to have redeemed the Church  
 with his own Blood; to answer with *Socinus*, that  
*Christ is God's*, his Blood might be stiled the Blood of God,

---

\* Col. i. 18.

† Acts xx. 28.

is such an odd way of Interpretation, as may serve to elude the Sense of the plainest Text. Can it be justly said, that God confirmed the Truth with *his own Blood*, because *Peter and Paul* and other Martyrs were undoubtedly *God's*? My Spirit and my Body are *his*; yet can it not in any Propriety of Speech be said, nor does the Scripture allow it to be said, if my Body be wounded, that God's *own Body* is hurt, or that what is perform'd by my Spirit, is done by the Spirit of God. But if that Evasion serve not, he tells us, *he prefers the Reading of the Manuscripts, which have the Church of the Lord which he redeemed.* But the common Reading being established upon the Agreement of so many good Manuscripts, \* which Dr. Mills upon good reason prefers and adheres to, there appears little ground to depart from it, where the Cause does not need it; besides that, *the Church of God, not of the Lord*, is the constant Stile of the New Testament, the latter Phrase not appearing to be once used.

As for the Honour, Glory, and Worship, given to Christ by Angels and Men, that 'tis only by the Father's Gift, as he so often suggests, 'twill be fully consider'd afterwards. That, *Isa. vi. 8. There were more Persons than one present*, Whom shall I send? and who will go for us? I readily grant; but find not, that there were more Gods than one present. The Expression rather implies, One God in a Plurality of Persons.

I THOUGHT indeed, from those numerous, and to appearance very plain Texts of Scripture, wont to be produced (some of which I mention'd) which set forth Christ under the distinguishing Titles and Characters of GOD, we could not well forbear concluding, that Deity in a proper Sense belongs to the Son of God. And that it seems wonderful, if no

---

\* In loc. Prolegom. p. 146. col. 2.



such thing was intended, that so little Caution is used to prevent the fatal Mistake. But our Author (after observing *that the Notion of three Persons being one God, is never once laid down in the Scriptures*, which hath been already accounted for) pretends 'tis Caution enough, *that when it (the Scripture) gives the Title of God to Christ, 'tis not to be understood as tho' he were God in the same Sense with the Father.* But how does this appear? If by the *same* he means as we do, in as true and proper sense, what Proof to convince us that 'tis not so to be understood? *That the Scripture always insists upon it, that there is but one God*, we do not only allow, but often urge; and *that it declares that this one God is the Father*, we deny not, but add, that the same Scripture declares also the Son to be God, and the God of *Israel*: yet take not this to be sufficient proof, or ground to conclude, that because Father and Son are two distinct Persons, therefore they are two different Gods.

'Tis evident, that the Caution which he pretends was given, proved not sufficient, when (as I took notice) in a manner, the whole Christian World; when the Reformed Churches in these latter Ages, professedly making the Scriptures their Study, the Rule of their Faith and Manners, settled in this Belief, unable to espy and escape the fatal Delusion; when under the influence thereof Religion eminently flourish'd, and innumerable Souls that ardently loved God and hated Idolatry, lived to his praise, and died with triumph. What says he to this? Why, first he would fain insinuate, what he will not find so easy to prove, That this is a *wrong Persuasion*, introduced under, and a part of, the *grand Apostacy*, to be reformed upon the Reformation, provided his Opinion be taken for the measure. Then he quarrels with the word *fatal*, by which surely I intended not, as I plainly intimated, that Men in this Belief must perish; but that it could not but be of dangerous consequence, to be deceived in the Object of

of their Worship, and the Ground of their Hope. What tho' *the Father has been address'd to as the Supreme Object of Worship*; will that exempt from Danger of Idolatry such as take Christ also to be true God, and worship him accordingly? At length he comes off thus: *His popular Harangue might be easily taken up by Papists, and turned against himself in favour of Transubstantiation.* (There would be more colour for this, if the Scripture did say as much in favour of Transubstantiation, as of the Deity of Christ.) *How easily may they argue from the Opinion of several Ages, nay, from the Opinions of such famous Men as Wickliff and his Followers, or of John Hus and Jerom of Prague, whom he will allow for Martyrs* (not surely for Transubstantiation) *and who yet all believed that Doctrine.* A little Reflection will shew the Sophistry of this. Transubstantiation is so far from having been the general and constant Doctrine of the Christian Church, that it came not in till the ninth Century, and was scarce establish'd till the eleventh; Times of greatest Ignorance and Superstition, by the confession of the Popish Historians themselves. Whereas that of Christ's Divinity has not only been generally received all along the better and more learned Ages of Christianity, but from time to time maintain'd against the most violent and subtile Opposition. Little Plea could be made from Scripture for the former, founded upon a few words, that were manifestly to be understood in a figurative sense, directly crossing the Reason and sound Senses of Mankind in a Case plainly subject to their Judgment: the latter, of mere Revelation, deliver'd in the plainest Terms, supported by a very great number of Texts, not to be wrested to another Meaning but by notable Methods of Artifice, and clearly above the Decision of human Science. That *Wickliff* and *Hus* and others, in the first Dawnings of Light, after Ages of the grossest Darkness, gave alarm to the Nations sunk into Vice and horrible

horrible Superstition, and attempted some Reformation, we gratefully acknowledge the Mercy of Providence in; tho' the Absurdities of Transubstantiation were not so fully seen, being not then the Subject of Controversy. But when the Reformation came to be establish'd amidst surprizing Increases of Light and Learning, not only this, but much less Errors of Popery were discarded. And tho' by the Policy of Hell, old Heresies were then revived and propagated with Craft and Industry, to disturb the glorious Design, and the Godhead of Christ particularly disputed and eagerly oppugned; yet this generally then obtain'd, and was settled, as a prime Article in the Confessions of the Reformed Churches. Nor, it may be, have there appeared, since the Apostles time, Men of greater Piety and Knowledge in the Scriptures, than those under whose Conduct this was done.

OUR Author grants the Truth of what I had observed, That we may be persuaded of the Existence or Being of a thing upon the clearest grounds, when yet we cannot comprehend it, or give a satisfactory account of it to our own Minds; but *denies that there are any clear Grounds to believe the thing at all, either in Reason or Revelation.* Here I must remind, that the main thing under debate, is, whether Deity does properly belong to Jesus Christ; and 'tis sufficient if we *find clear grounds* for the Affirmative in the Scripture, without running into Explications of the Trinity, or nicely setting out the Characters of Divine Personality. He adds, *The Scripture represents the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be three distinct Persons or Beings* (how and in what sense, hath been consider'd a little before) *but says not they are only three Distinctions in the same Divine Nature:* (nor are the words, *three distinct Persons or Beings*, the words of Scripture.) The only question here is, If the Scripture ascribe the same divine Perfections to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,  
and



and declares that there is but one God ; whether it be impossible or a Contradiction, that there should be such Distinctions in the Divine Nature, as may be a sufficient ground for distinct personal Attributions and Predications ? And unless this be plainly proved, our Debate is little concerned. Yet how this can be done, without pretending to determine what can, or cannot, be in the Incomprehensible Nature of God, I know not. A little Reflection upon the Shortness of our Understanding, may prevent our being positive and peremptory, in matters so much above us. And why should *the Nature of the Supreme God seem incapable of such an Abasement, and emptying of itself, as the Scriptures attribute to that divine Person, who took upon him our Nature ?* If Love that passeth Knowledge, and Goodness divine, will display its Glories in such an astonishing Condescension, we need not dispute and quarrel at its measures, so much above our Thought, as the Heaven is above the Earth. And why should it be impossible for the Nature of God to be united to the Nature of Man, under the distinct Consideration and Character of the Word, tho' it be not incarnate in the relation of the Father, or the Holy Ghost, and without being subject to the Changes and Passions incident to the human Nature ? I cannot yet perceive the Absurdity of supposing, that God may, for just and weighty Reasons, secure of his own Greatness, unite human Nature to his own in the Person of the Son.

HAVING examin'd his Objections against the common Doctrine, we may observe in what manner he attempts to clear his own Scheme of the Absurdities it is charged with. And is there no Difficulty in admitting two Gods ? a thing so abhorrent to Reason, and so contrary to Revelation, which expressly forbids the having any more Gods than one. *But where (says he) is the Repugnancy——seeing we own but one God in the most strict Sense of the Word ?* The

E

truth

truth is, the Scripture appears to me, to lie so cross to this Conceit, that it gives me a sufficient Prejudice and Aversion to any plausible Scheme, or Explication, that is advanced, if it leads me to have any more Gods than one: You may tell me again and again, we own but one supreme God, we take the other to be a different and subordinate God, yet properly God also, and not in a figurative Sense. You may say what you please; but it sticks with me, that the supreme God has told me, I must have no other God besides himself. You will, it may be, undertake to answer for me, by your prudent Distinction; but I shall scarce venture to trust it, and pay Worship and Allegiance to another God, e'er my Maker and undoubted Sovereign make the Distinction, and tell me in what Sense, and how far he will part with his Glory to another. As there appears not, in those Texts of Scripture that speak of the Unity of the divine Nature, the least Exception or ~~Reverence~~<sup>Reverence</sup>, in favour of any inferior or subordinate Deities; so 'tis the manifest Design and End of them, to prelude and take off from the Acknowledgment and Service of such, there being much less danger of running into the Opinion and Worship of many supreme Gods, which the Theology of the *Gentiles* did hardly allow. In short, while you own, and the Scriptures most plainly declare, that Christ is God, I must conceive him to be the same, or one, with the supreme God, or else another God: but that supreme God has expressly declared, that there is no God else besides him; that he knows not any other; that before him there was no God formed, neither shall there be after him, *Isa.* xlv. 5, 21. chap. xlv. 8. chap. xliii. 10. This not only awes me into Silence, but satisfies my Mind, and secures my Regards.

As for the Difficulty of owning a Creature, or another Being than God, to be the Creator of the World,

Wo  
mu  
con  
Au  
not  
from  
from  
rive  
wor  
than  
vati  
but  
Exij  
God  
signi  
he is  
with  
disti  
Bein  
(as v  
only  
made  
cing  
them  
and  
N  
Trya  
boaste  
there  
a Cre  
ther  
three  
God,  
Spirit  
to m  
Damm  
Servic

World, (to whom the Homage of all the Creatures must be immediately due) it will come to be farther considered afterward, in its proper Place. But our Author *thinks it most proper to speak of him as the Son, not as a Creature. Whereby he owns his being deriv'd from the Father in an ineffable manner; but distinguish'd from the Beings we call Creatures.* As if he who derives his Being and Power from another, or, in other words, is a voluntary Production, can be any other than the Creature of that other. For if the *Derivation were by Necessity of Nature*, Dr. Clark cannot but acknowledge, it would be *in Reality* ~~and~~ *Self-Existence* (the most peculiar Property of the supreme God) *not Filiation*; 2d Ed. p. 246. And what will it signify to give him the Name of Son, and tell us, he is distinguish'd from the Beings we call Creatures, without specifying how, and in what Sense he is distinguish'd, or what is the distinct Nature of those Beings, he will call Creatures? If he be fancy'd (as what may not a Man fancy?) to be distinguish'd only from other Creatures, by the Honour of being made first, and used as a sort of Instrument in producing them, he will not by this be distinguished from them in Quality of a Creature, but of Order only and Privilege.

NOR is it any more intelligible to me after closest Tryal and Application of Thought, and after the boasted Plainness of this sort of Christianity, that there should be a middle Being between God and a Creature, between finite and infinite, that is, neither one nor t'other; than that there should be three Differences in the incomprehensible Nature of God, mark'd by the Names of Father, Word, and Spirit. Besides, it seems strange and unaccountable to me, that I should be required, upon pain of Damnation, to believe in, and live devoted to the Service and Glory of I know not what Being, whom



I must not conceive to be either God or Creature only am told that he is called Son.

NOR is it more intelligible to me, notwithstanding the pretended Plainness of this Scheme, how a Creature should exercise a creating (that is, an infinite) Power. *But, says he, why may not the supreme Being be able to communicate to another, a Power of creating?* Possibly it may be as well asked, why he may not communicate Self-Existence and Eternity, or any other divine Perfections to another? I am sure the Scripture does every where set forth the great God, as the only Maker of Heaven and Earth, as distinguished from all others by this Character, and as demanding our Homage upon this account. Nor does it any where tell us, that he has communicated Creating Power to any (*Creature, or*) *Being* of a different Nature from himself. To suppose this in the Case of Christ Jesus, is to suppose what the Scripture says not, and to beg the thing in question against strong Evidence to the contrary. If the supreme God communicated Creating Power, did he after this do nothing, but leave the Management of the Creation to that other, to whom he had derived, and entrusted it? Is he no farther concerned in us, than in that he gave another the Power to make and govern us, and immediately to receive the entire Homage due from Creatures? Was God properly a Creator at all, when it was another that created all, tho' by a Power derived from him; when it was not properly his Work, but the Work of another, whom he did only impower and order to do it? It is by a Power derived from God, that we perform the common Actions of Life; yet it is not God that does these Actions, they properly belong, and are to be ascribed to the immediate Subject of that Power. Neither does it seem conceivable, that the Creating Act, or the Production of Being from nothing, should be divided between a superior and subordinate

nate Agent ; or that there should be Occasion, or the least Pretence of Reason, for God's making one Being first, that he might employ his Instrumentality in making the rest. How much more reasonable to believe, that as Creation could not be but by his Power, who made all things for himself ; so he would reserve entirely to himself the Glory, the Dependence, and Regards of his Creatures ?

It was farther objected as matter of Prejudice against the Scheme, that, contrary to the plainest Declarations of Scripture, it supposes the great Mediator to be neither true God nor true Man : but this is, it seems, no Difficulty at all to the Author ; to whom rather it looks indeed somewhat like an Absurdity, that he should be a Mediator between himself and Men. And were we in the Sentiment of the Sabellians, making the Father and Son to be the same Person, there might be Pretence for such an Objection ; but what Absurdity in supposing the Man Christ Jesus, related to, and inseparably united with the divine Nature, as distinguished in the Son, to bear the Character, and perform the Office of Mediator, between the supreme God and his revolted Creatures ? What Inconsistency, or so much as Incongruity, in conceiving, that distinct divine Persons, by Dispensation and Agreement, assume, and perform the part of distinct Offices ?

BUT however, methinks, our Mediator might be allow'd to be a true Man, and to have a rational Soul ; yea, says our Author, *If the Logos, or Word, was the Soul of the Man Christ Jesus, will not that be rational enough to make a Man ?* Very like, if a glorious Angel were the Soul of a Man, it might be rational enough : and so might the Being, which he yet ventures not to call a Creature, did he in earnest prove that the one or the other were properly a human Soul. But to assert or imagine, that it does become so, merely by animating organized Flesh in human Shape, agrees not any way with Scripture or  
Phi-

Philosophy, nor is the Fancy warranted or countenanc'd by the Language of either, but rather confounds the Nature of things, making all Spirits to be of the same Kind or Species, which seems to be utterly incapable of Proof; and who can say, that an human Soul becomes of the Nature of Angels, when divested of Flesh? That human Nature is often in Scripture, by an usual and easy Figure, signified by Flesh, which denotes that part of it that is visible, and falls under the notice of Sense, cannot well be denied; tho' considered and taken separately by itself, it is not Man. *Ex gr. All Flesh is Grass. All Flesh shall come to thee. No Flesh shall be justified. All Flesh had corrupted their Way,* Psal. lvi. 4. *I will not fear what Flesh, that is, ver. 11. I will not be afraid what Man can do unto me.* Thus, the WORD was made Flesh, importing, that he took not the Nature of Angels, or a mere human Body, but the Nature of Man, with its common Infirmities. ' Our Saviour (says \* Archbishop Tillotson) is frequently ' in Scripture and expressly said to be a *Man*, which ' could in no propriety of Speech have been said, ' had he only assumed a *human Body*; nor could he ' have been said to have been *made in all things* ' *like unto us, Sin only excepted*, had he only had a ' *human Body*, but not a *Soul*. For then the Meaning must have been, that he had been *made in all* ' *things like unto us*, that is, like to a *Man*, that only ' excepted, which chiefly makes the *Man*, that is ' the *Soul*: and the Addition of those Words, *Sin* ' *only excepted*, had been no less strange; because a ' *human Body* without a *Soul*, is neither capable of ' being said to have *Sin*, or to be without it.' Worthy Mr. *Withers* did not amiss observe, † ' That the ' Heresy of *Arius* consisted in three things, (1.) In ' affirming the Son of God was but a Creature,

\* Works fol. p. 553. † Mr. *Pierce's* West. Inquis. p. 104, 105 (2.)



(2.) That there was a time when he had no Existence. (3.) That his superangelical Nature animated his Body instead of a rational Soul. These were the peculiar distinguishing Opinions of that Man.' How far our Author is concern'd in 'em, I need not curiously enquire, (not forward to fasten a Charge of Arianism upon such as disown it, as he sometimes groundlessly suggests.) He now sees fit to declare for the last, tho' he speaks with more Reserve, in reference to the former, not much differing from the Language of the *Semi-Arians*, in the Passage a little before considered. *I think it most proper to speak of him (Christ) as the Son, not as a Creature; whereby I own his being derived from the Father in an ineffable manner, but distinguish him from the Beings we call Creatures.* I leave it to himself to shew, and to others to guess, whether this will exempt him from being truly a Creature, with respect to God, from whose Power and Will he derived his Being, tho' above the Rank of inferior Creatures. However, if his *Being* be not necessary, or derived by necessity of Nature, call him a Son, or an higher sort of Creature, must not the Self-existent God be before him? and must there not be some time or moment before his Production, or Existence? which how to distinguish for *Arius's* [*ὁ υἱος, ὅτε ἔκ' αὐτοῦ*] *There was a time when he was not*, they may do well to tell us, who would be thought not to be in his peculiar Opinions. And since they so often demand Explications of us, it seems not unreasonable to expect, that they should tell, what is to be understood by Christ's being begotten of the Father, in distinction from them, that are Sons of God by Creation, and prove their Sense from Scripture, and not put us off, by saying it is *ineffable*; or else what Advantage have they in this, as well as other Points, as to *plain Christianity*?

ADVANCING to the Examination of those Texts of Scripture, which our Author was pleas'd to take notice of, as wont to be alledged in Proof of Christ's Divinity, I observ'd a great Difference between the conjunct Evidence of many Texts of Scripture, and the Evidence of some single Passages, arbitrarily selected, and separately considered ~~as~~, which, says he, *I take to be really a Confession, that he has no Place in Scripture, that does separately declare his main Article of Christian Faith.* A strange Inference! when I had quoted several Texts that separately declare it; but however, where a Multitude and Variety of Texts concur, to give testimony to an important Doctrine, I take that Doctrine to be better established, than if signified in one or two Texts only in express Words, what he so often insists upon. The express Words of Christ are urged for Transubstantiation; *This is my Body.* Is it therefore an Article of Faith with him? or does he believe it the more in the literal Sense? He thinks he can easily avoid the Force of the Argument. If it was in express Words said in Scripture, the Father, Word, and Holy Spirit are one God; is he not acquainted with those, that can presently furnish with evasive Answers, and have Arts in readiness, to elude the plainest Texts? We are told, that God is a Spirit. The *Socinians* smile at the Proof of a single Text, however express, and containing a Doctrine of moment, and can readily enumerate several Senses in which [*πνεῦμα*] Spirit, is found, different from that, which we justly believe to be the true and intended. But the truth is, I scarce know any thing more fully, and more expressly declared in the Scriptures, than the Doctrine I am engaged in the Defence of, That there is but one God, and that Christ Jesus is true God. And tho' this, or the other Text apart, should be capable of another Meaning, and of being evaded; yet the conjunct Force and Evidence of a very great number

ber of Texts, pregnant with the same Doctrine, and running through the whole System of Gospel-Truth, must differently affect, and weigh much with the Judicious and Considerate.

(I.) THE first Text our Author mentioned, as a *grand Argument* for the Doctrine we maintain, is 1 *John*. v. 7. Tho', I said, for what reason this is set in the Front, and made so grand an Argument, can't escape Remark by such as know, that no extraordinary Stress is laid upon it, tho' it will not be easily parted with; which may consist well enough, with its being commonly *made use of* by those who *plead for the Doctrine*, and its being *chosen* by some as a *proper Text for Sermons upon this Controversy*.

As for its being genuine, I observ'd how much had been alledg'd by Men of great Judgment and Learning in defence of it. Not only *Gerhard*, and the famous *Dr. Hammond*, among many others, but *Dr. Mill*, and *Mr. Martin*, of late, had, after the most careful Researches, given the World sufficient Satisfaction about it. He would have this pass for an equal degree of Confidence, with what he had expressed on his side, in saying, That it was *past all Controversy*, that it was not genuine. It might possibly be so with him, and his Friends; but why might I not apprehend, the solid Reasons, offered in proof of the Text, capable of giving Satisfaction, when I perceiv'd it so general among such as had consider'd 'em? far enough from asserting, that it was past all Controversy. He thinks, *if I had looked into the Answer to Mr. Martin's Piece*, I might have had a different Opinion of it. I can tell him, that I had done this, and that I have also perused *Mr. Martin's Examination* of that Answer, and that I see not yet reason to alter my Opinion. I can tell him too, notwithstanding his little Insinuation to the contrary, which he might think for his Purpose, that I had carefully read the Authors I mention'd,

F

and



and others upon the Subject, and *Dr. Mill* particularly once and again, that I might form the best Judgment I could, upon the Probabilities offer'd on either side. I had *Socrates* also before me, when I wrote, and I fairly quoted, what he, as an Historian, relates: If he *blundered* in the Application, neither I, nor the Text under debate, are concerned in the Blunder.

- As for the Quotations out of *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, as a Proof that the Text was read in their time, long before the Rise of the *Arian* Controversy, they have been so well clear'd and supported by the judicious Remarks of *Dr. Mill* and *Mr. Martin*, against the Objections that have been made, that I see but little reason to be moved by them; tho' the Author *make bold to be of another Mind*. And tho' I did not with him boldly assert the Preface to the seven Canonical Epistles to be *plainly convicted of Forgery*; yet I mention'd it as doubtful, thinking *Dr. Mill's* Reasons against it sufficient Ground to suspect it. However, I justly took notice, that *Mr. Martin* maintains it, and takes some pains to prove it genuine, who still believes, that his Answers to the Objections deserve Consideration. And for its being antient, he says, \* 'This Preface is found in the Bibles of eight or nine hundred Years old; the *Latin* Churches have received it with their Bibles in all Countries, and at all Times; and no Person that we know of, in its passage thro' so many Ages, and among so different Nations, has charg'd it with being spurious.—— The Clouds of Suspensions and Doubts were not formed around it, till our Days.' *Mr. Simon* was content to conjecture, that it was compos'd by one of those whom *Charles the Great* employ'd to correct the Bible, in the Close of the eighth Century. But that those

\* *Mart. Exam.* p. 22, 23.

learned Men, appointed by that great Prince to make the Revise, should not have *Greek Manuscripts* to consult; should be so supine, in the Management of such an important Charge and Design, as little to regard them; or should presume to put this Text in their Bibles, without the Warrant and Authority of proper Manuscripts, seems not of easy belief, except with such as have espoused an Opinion, which they are loth to admit of any thing in prejudice of.

OUR Author \* *grants, that the Passage began to appear in the Latin Translation soon after the middle of the fifth Century*; however, adds, *which cannot be thought any great Argument of its being authentick*: insinuating a Charge of the most criminal nature upon the Orthodox, which he has not the least Proof of; which the vigilant and subtile *Arians* of those Times appear not to suggest, and which they would not have fail'd to expose; *viz.* the direct adding to the Scriptures, a Passage of so great Importance, which had not been found there before; which could not escape notice, which must needs alarm, and which they so little needed to support their Doctrine. Thus Dr. † *Bently* observes; 'If the fourth Century knew the Text, let it come in, in God's Name; but if that Age knew it not, then *Arianism* in its height, was beat down without the Help of that Verse. And let the Fact prove how it will, the Doctrine is unshaken.' The truth is, this was actually done by many worthy Writers, without being acquainted with, or making use of this Text. As for the Doctor's Manuscripts, when I see his Performance, I shall be able to make a better Judgment.

THE Passage did not only *appear soon after the middle of the fifth Century*, as is acknowledged; but upon such a solemn occasion, and in such circumstances, as

\* Pl. Chr. p. 23.

† Ans. to 2 Let. in *Eml.* Ans. to *Mart.* Dissert. p. 12.



cannot but weigh much with the considerate and impartial. By the Edict of King *Hunerick*, the cruel *Arian* Persecutor, the *African* Bishops were summon'd to defend their Doctrine by the Scriptures, in a publick dispute with the *Arian* Bishops; when this could not be avoided, under just apprehension of the consequence, a great number (near 400) met at *Carthage*, *An.* 484. a Confession of Faith was drawn up with great caution, and carefully examin'd, where this famous Text was particularly urged : Now, can it be imagin'd, that in such an Assembly, a Matter of such Moment, wherein several Bishops of great worth appear to be particularly concern'd, should be manag'd with so little discretion, as to lay so much stress upon a Text in *St. John's* Epistle, which was not there to be found, or was a late addition ; which the *Arians* might so easily confute, and shew the Fraud of, to their confusion, already under hardships, and the greatest disadvantage ? To say, *had the Dispute been held, the Text alledg'd, and the Answer by the other side related, it might give much light to the Matter,* is true ; but reaches not the Argument, as urged by us : They were doubtless upon their guard, under terror, by the Banishment of several of their Brethren a little before, and by the death of *Letus*, noted among them for his Piety, that very day committed to the flames. However, the ten Bishops that were chosen to manage the dispute, presented themselves at the place appointed, but were rudely treated ; and, when they began to speak, were, it seems, entertain'd with outcries, and blows too : But it was not upon this occasion that the Text first appear'd ; for, besides its being quoted by *Cyprian* so long before, it was expressly cited by *Eucherius*, sometime Bishop of *Lyons* in *France*, a matter of fifty Years before, as *Mr. Emlyn* confesses, and which he finds not any other way to evade, than by feigning, or fancying, it to be an Interpolation : And what Argument may



may not easily be eluded, if precarious and unproved suppositions, of that nature, will be taken for answer? It's still worthy of remark, that it appears not in those elder times to have any suspicion of Forgery cast upon it; but, wherever it appear'd, it has been look'd upon, as the genuine Writing of St. *John*. 'Tis in this latter Age, that the Anti-trinitarians, finding it necessary for their purpose, stick not to affirm, that it is supposititious. As for the *Greek Manuscripts*, upon which the Prints of the New Testament were form'd, though they at present appear not, whether mis-laid, or conceal'd, there appears no reason to doubt, that such there were, for which I need only refer to Dr. *Mill*, Mr. *Martin*, and Mr. *Nelson's* learned Friend.

WE may now rather proceed to consider the sense and import of the Words. *I took notice*, says our Author, *that a great stress is laid by some upon the Word* [*εἷς*] *in Jo. v. 7. and Jo. x. 30. One, say these Men, that is, one Thing.* \* *I shewed there is no necessity of such an Interpretation, but that the same Expression is used, where it is not possible it should be render'd One thing. This, Mr. Moore could not answer, and therefore he prudently took no notice of it.* However prudent he might fancy this Sort of Reflection to be, I am at a loss for the Justice of it, when I not only took notice of it, but, as I apprehended, made a plain Answer. Whatever stress he suppos'd some to lay upon the Word [*εἷς*] in the Neuter Gender, he does not find me to lay any

---

\* Dr. *Clark* observes, *Jo. x. 30.* our Saviour affirms, that He, and his Father, are not *εἷς* [not one Person; but *εἷς*] *one* and the same Thing in Effect, as to the exercise of Power. And *Tertullian*, and other Writers, commonly distinguish, that they are not [*unus*] one Person; but [*unum*] one and the same Thing. *Script. Doct. p. 2.* *Tertullian* against *Praxeas*, says, *Qui tres unum sunt, non unus; quomodo dictum est, Ego & Pater unum sumus, ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem.* Concluding, that the Father and Christ are [*εἷς*] *unum*, one Thing, that is, One in Substance.

such

such stress *barely* upon the Expression; for I granted, that in 1 Cor. iii. 8. it signifies *One* in Consent and Design, and that the Phrase is to be interpreted according to the subject Matter, and Circumstances of the Place, where it is used. I deny'd it not the same Sense and Signification in this, which therefore he needed not to quote *Beza* for; only observ'd, that this being suppos'd, yet something farther might be imply'd, yea, that something more seems plainly to be imply'd; and that is, that the *Three* in Heaven do not only agree in their Testimony, but that there is a peculiar Reason and Ground for their so agreeing; and this probably intimated and intended by the change of the Phrase, *ver. 7.* [ἐν εἰς] into [ἐκ τῶ ἐν εἰς] *ver. 8.* where, of the latter *Three*, it could not be affirm'd, as of the *Three* in Heaven, that they are *One* in Nature, but only *One* in their Testimony; and this, though the Complutensian Edition give not the same difference in the Phrase, as others, which might be an easy slip in the Copyer of that Manuscript. So that, though there be *no necessity*, that the Word [ἐν] do always signify *One Thing*, yet, that being the primary and more natural sense of the Expression, it is but reasonable to take in that signification, if nothing oblige to the contrary; especially, if the Subject-matter and Circumstances direct and determine to it. Nor should we think it sufficient, in the interpretation of holy Scripture, to give such a sense, as a Phrase, by it self, may be capable of, though perhaps it may best suit our private Opinion, or serve our present purpose; but what, upon just consideration, we take to be the real and intended Meaning.

It was farther argued, from *John x. 30.* *I and my Father are One*; and *John xvii. 11. 21.* *That they may be One, as we are*; the Word [ἐν] must be understood to signify and denote another kind of Oneness, than merely in Consent and Design. When Christ prays,



prays, *John xvii. 22.* [*ἵνα ὁμοίῃν, καὶ δὲς ἡμεῖς ἐν ἑσμέν*] that they may be One, as we are One; our Author asked, *And are we to think, that our Saviour desir'd his Disciples should be kept to be one Being?* I reply'd, that the word [*καὶ δὲς*] as, can denote here, (as *Mat. v. 48.* and many other Places) but a Similitude, or Resemblance, not Equality, or the same perfect Union: And so, when there appears a necessity of giving it this Sense, it ought to take place; and when he can shew the same necessity for this Construction, that it can denote but a Similitude, *John v. 23.* it may be admitted: In the mean time, it is not sufficient to say, the *Word* may be taken so, when there is no necessity.

WHEN he says, *The two Unities, which, I think, are here compar'd* (*Jo. xvii. 21, 22.*) *appear to him to be things, that carry not in them any Resemblance at all; for an Unity of Concord is entirely a different thing from an Unity of Being:* he seems to mistake my Meaning, or conceal the force of my Reason. He finds not, that I compar'd an Unity of Concord with an Unity of Being; but, supposing that there is an Unity of Being among the divine Persons, an Unity of Concord is a necessary result of it.

I OBSERV'D, *p. 19.* that, even among Believers, there is more, than a bare Unity of Concord and Design, since they are animated and acted by one and the same Spirit, which is a reason of their agreeing in one Design. Now this Spiritual Unity among Believers, which infers Unity of Concord, resembles, or is a shadow of, the Union between the Father and Christ; and so I added, this being possibly the nearest resemblance and similitude of it among Creatures, which hinders not, but rather implies, that Christ's Oneness with the Father is of an higher kind, of a more perfect and exalted Nature, than the Oneness among Christians. And indeed the things which are spoken of, as belonging to the Nature of God, cannot be ordinarily attributed to Creatures, but



but in an analogical sense, and in way of Resemblance.

As for Dr. *Whitby's* interpreting the Glory, which Christ gave his Disciples, *ver. 22.* to signify the Power of working Miracles; that hinders not, but that there is to be acknowledg'd an higher and nearer Union among them: the same Doctor observing on *ver. 20.* that these words, *viz. that they may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee,* are to be interpreted, not of an Union of Concord, but by the participation of the Spirit of the Father and the Son, is proved. See Note on Chap. 14. 20, &c. which Note deserves to be consulted.

I Took notice of two Arguments from the Doctor, that Christ is One with the Father, in a distinguish'd sense, *viz.* One in Essence, not in Concord only. 1. From the Security of the Sheep in the hand of Christ, being One in Power with the Father, and therefore One in Essence, as *Chrysostome* says. 2. From the Inference of the *Jews*, that by this he made himself God. He answers to the first, They may be One in the exercise of their Power; or farther, as that Power, which our Saviour exercis'd, was really the Power of the Father. But how he could exercise the Power of Omnipotence, which ~~he says~~ he was not really Possessor of, I cannot imagine. If he means only, that the Power, by which he wrought Miracles, was not properly his, but his Father's, impowering and enabling him; wherein did his Power differ from that of *St. Peter*, in the Miracles perform'd, except that he was vested with an higher Character and Office? Yet, how strange would it have look'd in *St. Peter* to have said, I, and my Father, or the God that gave me Commission, are one; the Works that he doth, I do also; that is, by his Power and Authority: whereas, *Acts iii. 12.* says he, *Why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own Power we had made this Man to walk?* But the *Jews* hence infer'd, *John x. 33.* that

that  
could  
no U  
pres  
that  
ly ha  
vert  
inter  
with  
Pow  
own  
it se  
repel  
that  
himse  
rank,  
the  
*ver. 3*  
of Go  
of him  
World  
God?  
prope  
emplo  
some  
me w  
nour,  
only t  
prope  
World  
Fathe  
on me  
And  
Works  
that I  
ther an  
nipote  
† Se

that he, being a Man, made himself God. Who could now imagine, but that if his Words had given no Umbrage, or occasion for the Inference, he would presently disclaim it with Indignation; and shew, that he abhor'd the Thought? That he would plainly have told them, you wretchedly mistake, and pervert my Words to an invidious Sense, which I never intended; meaning only to say, I am One in concord with my Father; agree in design with him; the Power, that I seem to exercise, is his, and not my own? Instead of clearly denying the Inference, as, it seems, in all Reason and Justice he ought, he first repels the charge of Blasphemy, either by shewing, that he was not obnoxious to their Law, by calling himself the Son of God, since others, of an inferiour rank, were called Gods; or by an Argument from the less to the greater, († as the Doctor observes) *ver. 35, 36. If he called them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctify'd, and sent into the World, thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?* q. d. If they were called Gods, in a more improper, and in a typical Sense, who were some time employ'd as God's Messengers and Servants, and had some temporary Assistances of his Spirit; can ye think me worthy of blame, as arrogating to my self an Honour, and a Power, that is not my due, when I tell you only the Truth, that I am, in reality, and in the most proper Sense, the *SON OF GOD*, who am come into the World upon the most glorious Design, according to my Father's Will, with the Power of the Spirit resting upon me without measure, and really dwelling in me? And then farther adds, *ver. 37, 38. If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not, &c.* q. d. Wonder not that I said, *I am the Son of God, and that I and my Father are One*, when ye see me do those Works of Omnipotence, which shew, that I have the same Power

---

† See Whitby's Note on *John* x. 34, 35.

with the Father, that || what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise.

2. THE second Argument for Christ's Divinity, which our Author took notice of, is, that *He is expressly call'd God in several Places of Scripture*: And he is pleas'd to suggest, that *I went over very superficially what was offer'd in the Letter on this Head*. Some weak Readers may possibly take this upon trust, but I am persuaded, on a review, the more judicious will find little reason for such a Remark. That others, *beside the supreme God, are sometime call'd God, upon the account of their special Dignity and Authority*, as he speaks, which is the Sum of the plausible reasoning of the Letter, need not be disputed. Nor is it deny'd, that Angels and Magistrates, in a popular and more improper way of speaking, or, in a figurative Sense, have been stiled Gods, on the account of some distant Resemblance, some partial Representation, or some Characters of Respect put upon them by him, who yet, in the compleat Idea and proper Sense, is the only true God. But now the Characters of Divinity are every where ascrib'd and challeng'd to the Blessed Jesus, in quite another manner, than to such, otherwise call'd Gods. Yea, says he, *as Christ is transcendently above all Angels and Governours, he may have this Title in a more eminent Sense*. But I take not the question to be, whether *Christ has an higher Right to this Title, than others*, as he expresses it; whether 'tis given him in an higher or lower Sense; but whether it is given him properly, and in the just latitude of the Idea? Otherwise, tho' he may, as others by a Figure, or by way of Allusion, be call'd God, he may be far enough from being truly so.

WE farther urge, that as the Name and Title of God is frequently given to him, which in but a few

|| John v. 19.

Instances

Insta  
out  
term  
apply  
nifest  
body  
Phara  
interp  
God  
jects  
conte  
ny tim  
Christ  
much  
appreh  
referen  
with  
Decer  
to suc  
Proof  
Scriptu  
but one  
is he:  
thing  
Deity,  
call'd  
approp  
others,  
ion as  
now e  
his own  
God,  
ng Go  
Deity,  
ding h  
the Na  
given t  
haps it



Instances is given to Creatures; so 'tis given without limitation, or any Circumstances that should determine it to a figurative Sense: whereas it is not apply'd to any others, but in such a manner, as manifestly to prevent danger of mistake. Nor will any body be at a loss, when Moses is said to be a God to Pharaoh; *ye are Gods, but shall die like Men*, &c. how to interpret the Expression, without supposing the great God to be intended, or others to be set up as Objects of Divine Worship. But our Author is not content only to say, *the Name is given to Creatures many times in the Scriptures, perhaps as many as it is to Christ*; but ventures roundly to affirm, *there is as much limitation, with reference to Christ, to prevent our apprehending him to be the supreme God, as there is with reference to any others*. That this should be spoken with so little Hesitation, with so little Guard and Decency, may seem somewhat strange and shocking to such as do but consider, (1.) That no other Proof is here offer'd for this, but saying, *The whole Scripture is a limitation, which determines, that there is but one God, and that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is he*: whereas this is no other than a begging the thing in question, that Christ must be excluded from Deity, because the Father is God; when his being call'd God's *OWN SON*, in such a peculiar and appropriate Sense, plainly distinguishes him from all others, and is far enough from being *as much limitation as there is to any others*; when the Jews knew not how else to understand his saying, that God was his own Father, but as making himself equal with God, *John v. 18*. when his being the Son of the living God, is wont to be made an Argument of his Deity, instead of being taken as a *Limitation* excluding him from it *as much as any others*. (2.) That the Name of God (and *Jehovah*) is so far from being given to Creatures *as many times as to Christ*, that perhaps it appears not at all to be given to any of them,

in such a Manner, as to Christ, but that there is some special Mark of Distinction: And that besides his having the Name of God given him, divine Perfections are ascrib'd to him in Scripture, and peculiar Marks of Divinity, which set him above the Rank of Creatures. (3.) That instead of designing *as much Limitation with reference to Christ, to prevent our apprehending him to be the supreme God, as to any others,* the Scriptures manifestly set him up, as the Object of our Devotion and religious Worship, and demand our Adoration and Services for him, which they expressly forbid to be paid to any others, which sets him at an utter distance from any others, that, in an improper Sense, may be call'd Gods, under this Limitation, Worship them not; worship God. (4.) That the common Sentiment and *Apprehension* of Christians, in this Matter, are very different from his, who, after serious Enquiry, and diligent Examination of Scripture, unable to find such Limitation, have still apprehended and believ'd, that Christ is there call'd God, in the strict and proper sense of the Word, and so as no others are.

THAT Christ Jesus doth so indifferently assume, and hath so often given him the Title of *LORD JEHOVAH*, (God's peculiar Name, as *Psalms lxxxiii. 18.* which the *LXXII's* Translation opposes not) our Author tells us, *need not give any Disturbance, for it is not unusual in the Scripture for one Person, when he represents another, to assume the Stile and Title of that other.* But I am at a loss for a just Instance of this Nature. For a Messenger to speak, in the Name of him that sent him, the Words that he had put into his Mouth, is a very different thing from assuming the proper Title and Stile of that other. And I much doubt, whether the Scripture, or any good Writer, has any Example of this kind; and suppose it not allowable for a Judge, acting in the King's Name, and by his Commission, or for an Ambassador, to

say

say  
ap  
C  
CH  
tiv  
no  
we  
I  
ha  
fer  
' i  
' M  
' t  
hap  
ten  
Pr  
Cer  
gui  
him  
from  
Etor  
Do  
of t  
tur  
in th  
for  
4. A  
the  
Etor  
Has  
impe  
der  
from  
Adv

†  
Apos  
um r  
chap.

say, I am *George*, King of *Great Britain*, &c. He that appear'd on *Sinai*, said, *I am the LORD THY GOD*; *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*. If *Christ Jesus*, in quality of his Father's Representative, might say, I am *J E H O V A H*, thy God, why not also, I am *G O D* the Father? *Dr. Whitby* seems well to have clear'd this Matter, on *John i. 1.* whence I took notice of his Observation as just, (which I had not only my self made before, but found it observ'd by the antient Writer † *Irenæus*) 'that nothing 'is absolutely in the Scripture, and in the Singular 'Number, call'd God, for any other Reason, than 'that the divine Nature is imparted to it.' Which happen'd, it seems, so much to shock our Author's temper, as made him forget the common measures of Prudence, as well as Justice in the temerity of his Censure. He is pleas'd to say, *The Doctor is not guilty of so great an Absurdity, and he has wrong cited him in several respects, unless he uses a different Edition from mine. The word absolutely is not used by the Doctor, but is an Addition of the Calm Defender's. The Doctor talks of the New Testament only, and, instead of that, our Author makes him speak of the Scriptures in general. — The word God is certainly used in the singular Number therein (in the New Testament) for such as were not properly God; 2 Cor. iv. 4. 2 Thes. ii. 4. Acts xii. 22. Finally, those Words, that hath not the Divine Nature imparted to it, are not the Doctor's, and I cannot but wonder at our Author's using them. Has Christ, according to his Opinion, the Divine Nature imparted to him? &c. Certainly our Author did not consider here what he wrote. What may not be expected from his Candour, who appears so willing to take an Advantage? What if he had not the second Edition*

---

† Néque igitur Dominus, néque Spiritus Sanctus, néque Apostoli, eum qui non esset Deus, definitive & absolute Deum nominassent aliquando, nisi esset verus Deus. *Irenæ. lib. 3. chap. 6.*



of the Doctor before him, whence I made the Quotation, but the first, as he says, *p. 67* or the Page had happen'd to be mistaken; it had been but just and reasonable in him to consult the other Edition, before he had charg'd me directly with so many Falsties, and suppress'd *evil Surmisings*, till he had the patience to examine. However, after all, there stand the Words in the Doctor, and in the Page, just as I quoted them; and I find them to be the same, even in this Edition, only a little before in the preceding Page, and in the Reader's View. But I shall forbear to return the civility of his Compliments, and to say, *'Tis below a Man of Honour and Conscience. Certainly this Author did not consider what he wrote.* Yet I suppose his Readers upon this, will hardly be so credulous and supine, as to take his Quotations and confident Assertions upon trust, and without Examination.

As for the *Absurdity* charg'd upon the Observation, no Shadow of it appears from the Scriptures he mentions. *2 Cor. iv. 4. The God of this World. 2 Thes. ii. 4. The Man of Sin, — shewing himself that he is God. Acts xii. 22. It is the Voice of a God, and not of a Man.* For, though the word God be there in the singular Number, it is neither used absolutely, nor in such Circumstances, as to leave the least room for danger of misapplying it. Nor am I concern'd in his reasoning about *having the Divine Nature imparted to it.* As the Expression was the Doctor's, I took not the liberty to alter it, understanding by it, what, if I had express'd in my own Words, would have been, That none in the Scripture is absolutely, and in the singular Number, call'd God, who has not, or is not Partaker of, the Divine Nature.

He proceeds to argue from *John i. 1. The Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Now, says he, and is not that God, who was the Word, plainly distinguish'd from the God, with whom, in the Beginning, he was? Was God the Word the same with him, with whom he was?

was ? and complains, that I took notice only of the latter Query, which was for no other reason, but because I took them to be both of the same Import, or at least imply'd and refer'd to in the Answer I made. And why may he not be the same in one respect, and yet differ in another? So God, the Word, may be *plainly distinguish'd* from the God, with whom he was, not in respect of Nature and Deity, but as a distinct Person. And who pretends, that the Son is the same Person with the Father? He insists, *the same numerical Being cannot differ from itself; if therefore the one Respect be that of his Essence, he cannot differ from him in any Respect*: which seems to be but playing with a Word, or taking the thing for granted, which should be prov'd, and then arguing from that Supposition. If by the same *numerical Being*, he will needs understand the *same Person*, it cannot differ from it self; but if by *Being*, the Nature and Essence of God be denoted, how does he know, that there cannot be more Persons, than One, in it, that may differ from each other? except he has such an exact Measure and perfect Knowledge of the incomprehensible Nature of God, as to be able securely to define, what is possible, or not possible to be found in it. *A Man*, says he, *may distinguish the several Attributes of the same Being in his Thoughts; but he cannot suppose the same Being to be the Subject and not the Subject of the same Attributes*. For my part, I know not any body that makes such a Supposition; but can, in my Thoughts, easily distinguish the Attributes and Perfections of the Divine Nature, from those Differences therein, which the Scripture speaks of, under the notion of distinct Persons. He adds, *'Tis impossible, that the same Essence should be both begotten and unbegotten*. But why may not the Father beget the Son in the same Essence? However, the manner of Generation, or of the Father's begetting the Son, is not the subject of our Debate; nor am I any more concern'd

to explain or account for it, than he, whose own Scheme likewise acknowledges, *p. 19. the Son's being derived from the Father, in an ineffable Manner. As for his saying, he has no notion of a distinct Person, that does not imply a distinct Being; I have spoken before so distinctly of this Matter, as may supersede farther Discourse about it in this Place.*

I HAD said, Why may we not suppose, that his Godhead was the same with that of his Father, tho' he was in some sense different from him, who in order of Subsistence, and in way of Distinction, bears the Name of God, and the Father? And what have I herein advanced that is new, that is shocking to the Reason of Mankind, or disagreeing to the common Faith of Christians? What, that is not generally taught, and receiv'd, as plainly revealed in the Scriptures? Whence then the sudden (not to say unmanly) Outcry? *Is this the Christian Religion? Is this the Doctrine of the Gospel? Is this a fundamental Article of our Faith? &c.* It might perhaps be thought popular and moving, and make some impression on weak Minds, how little soever I am concern'd in it. For after all, it appears clear in Revelation, of great and diffusive Influence in Christian Religion, that there is but one God, that Jesus Christ is God, that he and the Father are spoken of as different Persons.

BUT our Author thinks it for his Purpose to repeat a few more Queries, which the Letter put upon this Text in John, which he pretends Mr. Moore had not vouchsafed to answer; though I thought 'em sufficiently answer'd, as far as there was any occasion. However I'll gratify his Importunity. Says he, *Does the Evangelist design to tell us, That the Word was with himself?* Ans. No. *Who ever talks after that rate?* Nobody that I know. *Why was not the Expression, And the Word was with God, entirely left out?* Because it was incongruous to his Design, and he hereby fitly expressed



pressed the Distinction between the Father and the Son. Does it add any thing to the Sense, provided the next Expression is thus to be understood, And the Word was the supreme God? Yes, a great deal, to assure us, that the Father and Word, however distinct in another respect, are yet one and the same God. *Whatever the Meaning is, of being with God, according to these Men, was it possible that he should be otherwise than with him, if he had the same individual Essence with him?* Ans. No, by no means. Since he thinks these Queries of so much weight, as to repeat, and inculcate them, I was unwilling again to pass them without plain and categorical Answers.

THE other Text which he alledg'd against Christ's being God, in the strict Sense, tho' he be called God, is *Psal. xlv. 7.* cited *Heb. i. 8, 9.* *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever; God, thy God, hath anointed thee, &c.* adding, *Can he be the Supreme God, who has one to be a God to him, and to bestow a Reward upon him?* Then says, *Mr. Moore's Answer here is exceeding superficial.* As if Christ was not to be considered as a complex Subject, of whom some things are evidently spoken with reference to his divine Person, others with respect to his human Nature, and others that directly concern his Office as Mediator. Which, if well weighed, and compared with what he has offered to invalidate it, will appear not so superficial, as he would have it thought. The Observation I take to be just, of necessary Use and Application in several Cases. It is so with respect to Man, that is also a complex Subject. If a Person be affirmed to be of such a Bulk, or Weight, or Tallness, 'tis plainly meant of his Body: If he be said to perceive, to understand, to be conscious, 'tis supposed to be intended of his intelligent Mind. Such Expressions are commonly allow'd and understood; nor is there much danger of any one's imagining hence, that *Thought* belongs to him

H

in

in reference to his Body, or Gravity to his Soul. A Man may be also considered under the Notion of an Husband, or in Quality of a Magistrate, and be the Subject of very different Predications, with respect to those different Characters and Relations: And what is spoken in reference to one, may sometimes not be truly said of him, in reference to the other, nor is there in such Cases much Danger of Mistake. Who sees not, that some things may be spoken of our Saviour, as he is Man, as he is the Messiah, or as vested with the Office of Mediator, which belong not to him merely as God? Why may he not in such a Capacity and Condition, have his Father *to be a God to him*, and receive a *Reward from him*, without Impeachment of his Divinity? With this plain Distinction we may securely attend our Author's Reasoning, remembring that the thing which he labours to prove, is, That the Son is a different God from the Father; that tho' he be called God, yet he is not the supreme God. *But why*, says he, *should the Father be our Saviour's God?* I answer; Considered as Man and Mediator, he acts by his Authority, and receives the promised Reward from him for his Service. *Why is Christ's divine Nature never called the God of his human Nature?* As the Scripture has not the Expression, so I can find no Sense in it, that the Deity should be the God of the Humanity. *How will he answer what is alledg'd in the Letter, that the Head of Christ, this complex Person is God?* As Christ is Man and Mediator, he is subject to the Father. A Man may measure the Height of the complex Person, called *James*, without taking the Dimensions of his Mind. Thus upon my Principles our Saviour may be justified, in saying, My Father is greater than I. *But to say the I does not mean his complex Person, is absurd, and opens a Gap for Equivocations:* No more than to say, My Neighbour is greater than I; meaning

meaning, in respect of bodily Stature, or Dignity of Office, without intending to affirm, that he is of a different, or more excellent Nature. So a Man may be justified in saying, a Child is greater than himself, meaning than his little Finger. Ans. Not unlikely, if his little Finger were himself. And methinks there is a wide Difference between the Man Christ's saying, I am greater than myself; which is no way allowable in Propriety of Speech; and his saying, *My Father is greater than I.*

BUT farther, as to that Text (which indeed 'tis time to consider) *Christ is there spoken of as God.* But this is the thing in question, and which we expected the Proof of. That he is there stiled God, and acknowledged to be truly so, is not questioned; but whether he be spoken of precisely under that Consideration, and not rather as Messiah and Mediator, acting under that Character, and as vested with that Office: And while this is here so plainly signified, in that he is said to be anointed, &c. this Scripture is far enough from leading us into a dangerous Error, by speaking in an unguarded manner. Nor is there much more danger of Mistake, under such a Limitation, and in such Circumstances, tho' the Words were render'd, *O God, thy God hath anointed thee:* which therefore, *tho' follow'd by the French, Dutch, Tremellius, and \* Beza,* yet without their favouring, or going into our Author's Sense. The truth is, whatever the Hebrew may be thought to bear, the proper and grammatical rendring is, *God, thy God;* and so 'tis rendred by the *Septuagint, Syriack,* and vulgar *Latin;* by *Arias Montanus,* our Translation, the *Italian at Geneva,* the *Spanish, &c.* And as there appears not the least Necessity for the other rendring,

---

\* Former Edit. of *Beza*, Fol. As the *Camb. Edit.* Fol. Anno 1642. have it as we render, *God thy God.* So *Tremellius's* Translation of the *Syr. New Testament.*



so it is not countenanc'd by any old Translation. If, however, it should be admitted, (which I see little reason for) that Christ is here spoken of as God, as *Dr. Whitby notes upon the Place, that he is God of God, according to the Nicene Symbol*, it may signify only his Subordination, as Son; not any Inferiority of Nature: Nor can any more be inferr'd, than that he is the Son of the Father, who is the first in Order among the divine Persons, consecrated by him to the Office of Mediator; not that the Father is a different and an higher God.

I TOOK notice, that even in the same Place, as there is occasion, some things are ascribed to Christ under one Consideration and Character, and some under another. Our Saviour's Question to the Pharisees, *Mat. xxii. 45. If David call him Lord, how is he then his Son?* shows this. It may be thus here intimated, that he has a Throne and Dominion, as God by nature; which is for ever and ever, different from his Mediatorial Kingdom, which he is shortly to resign. And why this *may not be*, as I suggested, I find not our Author to offer any cogent Reason. Only he would have me to *produce the Places of Scripture, where this Doctrine is plainly and clearly expressed*; adding, *his Argument from this Text will not prove it*. But this was not the thing I was upon, or the Matter of Debate, but incidental only, and what it was sufficient for my purpose barely to suggest. Yet it need not seem strange or unreasonable to suppose, that He who in the Beginning was God (which we are sometimes told is a Title of Office, and signifies Dominion) had, antecedently to his Death and Exaltation, the Right of Dominion over the things created by him, and for him; by whom they do consist, and who upholdeth all things by the Word of his Power, *Heb. i. 3*. Than which, what can be spoken more magnificently of the Almighty? He who made the World may be thought

to

to go  
ator  
refu  
the  
of the  
that  
celler  
to mu  
tance  
Gift.  
Natu  
clar'd  
man  
a Na  
thoug  
mate  
deny  
be me  
by th  
last I  
incon  
he w  
on, e  
3. T  
swer,  
ever.  
Reply,  
put un  
did pu  
with  
be ne  
make  
to ma  
Tenou  
the co  
treati

\* PH

to govern it. Who will not take the Right of Creator and Preserver to be different from that which results only from an arbitrary *Grant*? He thinks the *Observation might have been spared, if the Scope of the Apostle had been consider'd; which was to prove, that Christ had obtained by Inheritance a more excellent Name than the Angels; and therefore is made so much better than they, ver. 4.* As if the Inheritance might not come by natural Right, as well as Gift. What hinders, but that he, who was Heir by Nature, and by Creation, might be particularly declar'd such upon special occasion; and, upon Performance of the Work he undertook, as Mediator, have a Name given him, above every Name? However, though I suggested, that this possibly might be intimated, which I was under no necessity to prove, I deny'd not, that the Dominion here mention'd might be meant of his Mediatorial Kingdom, which he has by the Father's Grant, and is to be resign'd at the last Day. But then I am so far from apprehending it inconsistent with Christ's Deity, that I see not how he would be capable of such a Throne and Dominion, except he be God, as well as Man.

3. THE next Argument the Letter proposes to answer, is *Rom. ix. 5. Who is over all, GOD blessed for ever.* And says, *the Apostle's Words will serve for a full Reply, 1 Cor. xv. 27. When he saith, All Things are put under him, it is manifest, that he is excepted, who did put all Things under him.* This possibly might pass with him for a Shift and Evasion, to whom it \* *must be necessary so to explain any particular Passage, as to make it consistent with the Opinion he has undertaken to maintain, and will suppose to be according to the Tenour of the Gospel.* It is a Satisfaction to find, that the common Faith labours not under the necessity of treating the Holy Scripture in this manner, of ex-

---

\* Pl. Chr. p. 35.

plaining away the obvious and apparent Sense, and forcing it into some specious Consistency. No doubt but *he is excepted, who did put all Things under him*; nor does any body pretend, that the Son is over the Father, or that the Father is *put under him*; yet that hinders not, but that the plain Characters of Deity are in this Text apply'd to Jesus Christ. To say, that then *there are two absolute supreme Beings*, is to obtrude a Consequence, which we utterly disown, and have plainly discover'd to be groundless and unjust.

OUR Author indeed thinks, *there is no great Difficulty in allowing the Term God to be given to him*. A wonderful Concession! when he makes no Scruple to allow it to Creatures, even of an inferior rank. But, after all, he has not been able, that I can find, to alledge any Text, where the word God is absolutely, and in the singular Number, apply'd to any other, but the Almighty.

THE asserting him to be over all, says he, is agreeable to the Scriptures, which every where attribute this to the Gift of the Father: yet neither does this Text say, nor can he produce any other, that says, he is God over all, by the Gift of the Father. That this is the proper Character of the supreme God, *Ephes. iv. 6.* himself will confess; but in what Scripture (not to say Christian, or so much as Gentile Writer) does he find the Title [*ὁ ὅτι πάντων θεός*, God over all] used to denote a God of an inferior Rank, or any other than the most High? unless he may be allow'd to understand it thus in this Text, which is more than will be easily granted.

NOR does he quote any Place in the New Testament, where [*εὐλογητός*, blessed] is ascribed to any other, but the supreme God: The Appellation appears to be appropriate to him, not only in the common Language of the Jewish Nation, and almost all Antiquity, (if we may believe \* Mr. Whiston) but directly

\* Prim. Faith, p. 7.



and expressely, *Mark* xiv. 61. *Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?* And though among a great Number of Places, where [כרוך] is by the Septuagint render'd [εὐλογητός] there be five mention'd by our Author, *Gen.* xxiv. 31. *Deut.* vii. 14. *Ruth* ii. 20. 1 *Sam.* xv. 13. *Chap.* xxv. 33. (for in the sixth, *Gen.* xxvi. 29. the word is εὐλ γινώσκω) in which the word is not appropriated to the Blessed God; yet even there [εὐλογητός] is not used absolutely, as in the Text: nor do I see it any where so used in the Scripture, but as apply'd peculiarly to him; much less as it is here, *\* blessed for ever.* Nevertheless, though this, or the other *Word*, or *Phrase*, singly and apart should be found capable of some other Sense, or Meaning, (a method of interpreting Scripture too often attempted to elude the Force of *any particular Passage*, that stands in the way) yet these Expressions together, in conjunction, seem not capable of being apply'd to any other, but the supreme God. The Evidence of this is so full and glaring, as to induce not only *Mr. Whiston*, and most of the *Arians* and *Socinians*, in favour of their darling Opinions, but our Author also, to take refuge in an odd and precarious rendring of the Words, by way of Doxology to the Father: whereas he had before freely own'd, what *Socinus* also could not but confess, that the Words were spoken of Jesus Christ. He was particularly press'd, and concluded, by the Observation, (a Difficulty which our Author is prepar'd to break thorough, to make it consistent with his Scheme) that [θεὸς εὐλογητός] *God be blessed*, is such an unusual and unnatural

\* The constant Epithet and Periphrasis of the great God (says *Dr. Whitby* in *loc.*) in the Old Testament; 1 *Chron.* xvi. 36. *Psal.* xli. 13. and lxxxix. 52. and also in the New. This was so evident to *Enjedinus*, the *Socinian*, that he saith, this Epithet is so peculiar to God the Father, that it is never attributed in the New Testament to any other; but wheresoever we find this Phrase, *God blessed for ever*, it is always ascribed to the Father.

Ex-

Expression, as is not to be admitted. And as in the New Testament, the certain and constant manner of expressing the Doxology, *blessed be God*, is by setting [*εὐλογητός*] *blessed*, before *God*; *Luke* i. 68. *2 Cor.* i. 3. *Eph.* i. 3. *1 Pet.* i. 3. so 'tis also in the LXXII's Translation of the Old Testament: though the Expression occurs in a great number of Places, yet I find not so much as one, where this order is not observ'd. Besides, the other Circumstances of the Text do so manifestly determine the application to Christ, that, upon the whole, neither the Orthodox nor *Arians* appear heretofore to have fix'd on this novel Device, and method of Construction.

WHEREAS I observ'd, that the Expression, *blessed for evermore*, manifestly denotes, in the New Testament, the most high God, and is apply'd to him, *Rom.* i. 25. as distinguish'd from all Creatures whatsoever; our Author says, that in *2 Cor.* xi. 31. 'tis apply'd to God, as distinguish'd from our Lord Jesus Christ, which I utterly deny in the Sense I intended, and must be suppos'd to intend, as the meaning of the Text: for, though in the latter Place the Father, under the Character and Relation of a Father, be distinguish'd from Christ; yet not so, as in the former, where, by the Character of *blessed for ever*, God is consider'd apart from, and stands in opposition to, Creatures: but it is not under this Consideration, that the Father is distinguish'd from Christ.

THAT we must conclude, from these exalted and distinguishing Titles, so freely given to Jesus Christ, that he is God in the strict and proper Sense, I see no reason yet to doubt, while we rest content with plain Revelation. And as we need not puzzle our Minds about unrevealed things, or insist on bold and unnecessary Explications; so nor be much concern'd at our Author's disregarding the Distinction between personal Properties and Characters, belonging to the Nature of God, till he can prove an Inconsistency. *Theo-*

*phylact's*

*phyl*  
and  
God  
went  
as h  
gest,  
Fr  
by  
nit  
Read  
hard  
the F  
when  
All.

tions  
follow

† M  
scri  
any  
beli  
us  
clea  
ned  
Sen  
Scr  
ther  
in t  
by  
the  
imp

(4.  
as alle  
the C  
we ca  
done

\* D  
II B  
III A

*Phylact's* Remark, that hence *Arius* is confuted; and put to shame, *St. Paul* proclaiming Christ to be God over all, is not less just for his living in the eleventh Century: Nor did I give it from *Dr. Whitby*, as he confidently affirms; but for him farther to suggest, that I quoted not the Doctor right, saying, From the Beginning these Words have been used by the Fathers, as an Argument of Christ's Divinity, \* is methinks too bold an Attempt upon his Reader's patience; particularly, when he adds, I hardly believe *Dr. Whitby* so injudicious, as to suppose All the Fathers from the Beginning used this as an Argument: whereas neither I, nor the Doctor, used the Word All. And yet, how many he quotes in his Annotations on this Text, even before the *Nicene Council*, following the learned *Dr. Bull*, † is very remarkable; ‡ None ever saying, that any did then actually ascribe them (the things here spoken of Christ) to any other Person. || As for us, who do in earnest believe the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, let us take all our Doctrines and Opinions from those clear Fountains of Truth, not disturb'd and darkened by searching anxiously into all the possible Senses, that the several Words and Expressions of Scripture can bear, and by forcing that Sense upon them, which is most remote and unnatural, and, in the mean time, wilfully overlooking and passing by that Sense, which is most obvious and easy to the common Apprehension of any unbiass'd and impartial Reader.

(4.) THE next thing our Author took notice of, as alledg'd in proof of the Deity of Christ, is, that the Creation of the World is ascrib'd to him: And we cannot but esteem it of great weight, since 'tis done so frequently, and in the strongest Terms. Who

\* *Dr. Whitby* in loc. Vol. 2. p. 53. 2 Edit. p. 52. pr. Edit.

† *Bull. Defen. Fid. Nic. p. 128.* ‡ *Dr. Whitby* in loc. as above.

|| Archbishop *Tillotson*, fol. p. 549.



can forbear concluding, that || *the invisible Things of him from the Creation of the World are clearly seen by the Things that are made, even his eternal Power and God-head?* What plainer and more convincing Evidence, what more illustrious Notices can we have, of the divine Being and Perfections, than the Works of Creation and Providence, which bear the most sensible marks of Omnipotence and unerring Wisdom? Now since \* *in the Beginning was the Word, since the World was made by him, and without him was not any Thing made, that was made*; why may we not with Assurance infer, that *the Word is God, or that in the Beginning he was God?* Must we not consider him, as the proper Object of our Adoration, as worthy of our Homage, when we deriv'd our Beings immediately from him, and he does still † *uphold us, and all Things by the Word of his Power?* Can we think our selves excus'd from the Submission and Acknowledgements of Creatures, by being told, that he created, and doth sustain all Things, only by a *derived Power*, as the Instrument of a superior Being? Did the Scripture any where tells us of an Instrument in Creation, or Philosophy instruct us in the Nature and Operation of it, we need not be at a loss to conceive, what now seems to pass all Understanding.

As for Christ's acting by a derived and delegated Power, if hereby is meant only, that the Operation was properly and immediately the Father's, in virtue of which the World was produc'd, as the Miracles wrought by the Apostles, wherein their Faith and Prayer might be concern'd, but not their Power properly employ'd or exerted; then any Angel, or meer Man, might be such an Instrument. But if Christ was the immediate Subject of the Power and really possess'd of Omnipotence, no less being necessary for the creating of the World, in the com

|| *Rom. i. 20.*

\* *John i. 1. iii. 10.*

† *Heb. i. 3.*

\* N

mon Opinion of *Jews and Heathens* as well as *Christians*, I see not but Deity must belong to him in the truest Sense; the thing we are pleading for. Nor need we look for an higher Power, or worship another and an higher God, than him, who by an inherent Vertue in himself made the Heavens and the Earth, and all things in them. Nor can the most High give us a greater and better Proof of his Existence, of his Eternal Power and Godhead, or demand our Homage upon a better Right, than that of Creation. It is by this that he has been known and rever'd in the World. \* *Thou, even thou art Lord alone, thou hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens, with all their Host, the Earth, and all things that are therein.——And thou preservest them all, and the Host of Heaven worshippeth thee. Thou art the JEHOVAH.* I thought it then reasonable to ask, Whether an infinite Power can be deriv'd or imparted, except the Divine Nature, to which it seems inseparably to belong, be communicated? To which he replies, *And is not this a wise Question? Must not our Author by the Divine Nature here necessarily mean the individual Nature of him that communicates it? And is it not a flat Contradiction to say, that any one does communicate his own individual Nature?* As wise as the Question is, I see he cares not to answer it, but quibbles, and seeks to raise a Dust about the words *individual* and *communicate*, to cloud the Sense, and divert the Reader's Attention. He knows well enough, that we take not the Son to be the same individual Person with the Father, and yet Partaker with him of the same undivided Godhead; in which he finds it not so easy to prove any Inconsistency or Contradiction. And whether infinite Power do not inseparably belong to the Divine Nature, is still a question; whether it can be communicated any more than Self-

\* Neh. 9. 6, 7. Isa. 37. 16.

Existence, or any other Property of the Divine Nature; or whether any can be the Subject of it, that has not the Divine Nature.

THAT God made the World immediately (says he) is not said in the Scripture; nor do I find it said in Scripture, what he is so fond of saying, that the Son did create by a Power derived from the Father. Yet such Expressions are used, as in the plain and obvious Meaning seem to import no less, than that God made the World immediately. \* *I am the Lord that maketh ALL things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens ALONE, that spreadeth abroad the Earth BY MY SELF.* † *Which ALONE spreadeth out the Heavens.* || *He commanded, and it was done.* \*\* *He said, Let there be Light, and there was Light.* No appearance of room for an Instrument, no intimation of any such thing. He did it by himself; yet he was not so alone in the Beginning, but the Word was then with God, and without him was not any thing made that was made. ||| *The Lord possessed me in the Beginning of his Way, before his Works of old. When he prepared the Heavens, I was there; when he appointed the Foundations of the Earth, then I was by him.*

BUT, says our Author, Mr. Moore acts very prudently in passing by the Texts I urged, Heb. 1. 2. *By whom also he made the Worlds;* Eph. 3. 9. *where God is said to make all things, &c., by Christ.* The truth is, I thought I had in short given a sufficient Answer; yet refuse not a little farther to clear the Matter. Since he argued from the Force of the Preposition [*ἐκ*] with a genitive Case, I reply'd, If it be said that [*ἐκ*] implies his acting only by a delegated Power, 'tis known, and cannot be deny'd, that the same Expression is used with respect to the Supreme God, Rom. 11. 36. He supposes I cited Col. 1. 16.

\* Isa. 44. 24.

\*\* Gen. 1. 3.

† Job 9. 8.

|| Psal. 33. 9.

||| Prov. 8. 22, 27, 29, 30.

where



where the Expression is, [ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα] *By him were all things created*; but I refer'd to Jo. 1. 3, 10. [πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο] *All things were made by him*. Compare this with Psal. 33. 6. *By the Word of the Lord* [τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου] *were the Heavens made*, Heb. 11. 3. *The Worlds were made by the Word of God*, [ῥήματι θεοῦ.] As these latter Expressions seem to signify Creation, perform'd properly by the *Word*, without the least notice of Instrumentality; so in Rom. 11. 36. *Of him, and by him* [ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ] *are all things*. Heb. 2. 10. *For whom are all things, and by whom are all things*, [δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' ὃ τὰ πάντα] the Preposition [δι'] manifestly denotes, or relates to, the principal Cause. Thus also, Rom. 6. 4. *Christ was raised by the Glory of the Father*, [διὰ τῆς δόξης] or, by his glorious Power, Eph. 1. 19. \* *Dr. Whitby*, speaking of the Expression, Heb. 1. 2. *By whom he made the Worlds*, affirms that the Greek Fathers unanimously say, [τὸ θεολογικὸν τὸ θεόπηγον] this shews the Divinity of Christ. † *Athenagoras* (in the second Century) uses [πρὸς] as well as [δι'] in reference to the Son's Operation, [πρὸς αὐτὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο, ἐνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, &c.] 'Of or from him, and by him, were all things made, the Father and Son being One, the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son.'

I am at a loss to understand our Author, when he says farther; *Now, if he would speak home to the purpose, and make a Parallel between God and Christ, he must search for some place, where Christ is said to have created all things by the Father; for upon that the Stress of the Argument lies*. For I was not making a Parallel between God and Christ; but shewing that Christ is God, and that it is no prejudice to his Divinity, that in the Business of the Creation, the word [δι']

---

\* In loc. p. 510. 2 Edit.

† P. 38. Edit. Ox.

by, is used of him, it being also used with respect to the Father's Operation: nor was there any occasion I should attempt (so odd a thing as) to invert the Order among the Divine Persons; or suppose that Christ is not truly God, or his Deity not proved by his creating all things, except he made them by the Father. That \* *God made the Earth by his Power, and established the World by his Wisdom*, we may securely believe, without supposing his Word, his Wisdom, his Power, to be Instruments or inferior Agents, by Nature different from himself. Creation being the joint Work of Father and Son, whose Power and Wisdom do not really differ, infers not any other Subordination, but that of Order. As to what he refers me to, in answer to *Arius detected*, Part 1. p. 14, 15, 16. I can find nothing there, but what is here clearly answered.

I observ'd as very remarkable, that the inspir'd Writer to the *Hebrews* does, Chap. 1. 10. without Difficulty or Hesitation, without any Explication to limit or qualify the Sense, apply directly to Christ, what *Psal. cii.* is confessedly address'd to the Supreme God: *And thou, Lord, in the Beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thy hands; they shall perish, but thou remainest, &c.* And our Author confesses, that the *Argument has not been fully answered*. He is not ignorant that various Arts have been tryed to elude the Force of it, that both *Socinians* and *Arians* have used all their skill, and taken a great deal of Pains, to avoid it. How unhappy, that they never lighted on the *Hint* he lately received? But to abate *Mens Triumphs* from this Text, and prepare the way to the novel Interpretation, that they are henceforth to receive, he desires the Reader to observe, that 'tis not easy for us, in some Cases, u

---

\* Jer. x. 12.

account for the Manner in which the Writers of the New Testament do cite Passages from the Old. Suppose this should be true, we cannot hence infer or imagine, that they did mistake in their Citations, that they did misapply them, or turn them to a Sense which was not intended. He instances in *Hosea xi. 1.* And called my Son out of Egypt. Let a Man read, says he, what follows there, and he will be apt to think, that Israel is to be understood in the common Sense, &c. If this also be allow'd, yet it hinders not, but the Passage is justly apply'd to Christ. Will any Man now be so absurd, as upon this account to argue, that the Children of Israel were the Christ? No, doubtless; the Absurdity is too manifest for any body to fall into it, and the thing related is certainly true, both with respect to Israel and Christ, that God brought the one and the other out of Egypt. Whether therefore this be spoken only of Christ, or rather also perhaps of Israel, as a Type of him, the Application is both right and safe. Israel and David were Types of Christ, and therefore 'tis not unusual for Christ to bear the Name of each in the Old Testament: *Isa. xlix. 3.* *Ezek. xxxiv. 23.* \* Jerom observ'd in reference to this Passage, *Ea quæ τινὸς præcedunt in aliis, juxta veritatem & adimpletionem referuntur ad Christum.* Such things as were typically before fulfilled in others, may in respect of the Truth, and perfect Completion, be referred to Christ. Yet he would have it thought, That the Argument may be made as strong for that, as mine is in the present Case; for that the words in *Psal. cii.* do not appear more plainly to be spoken of the Supreme God, than the other do of the Children of Israel. Whereas there is not the least Ground for this. Certainly, the words are not spoken typically of God, to have their full Accomplishment in Christ; and if

---

\* Pocock in loc.



they belong peculiarly to the Supreme God, how can they be safely apply'd to Christ, unless he be acknowledged and consider'd as such? *Grotius*, who seem'd willing to favour the *Socinians* in the Interpretation of this Place, supposes that the Apostle does accommodate unto the Messiah what was spoken of God, and thinks it a sufficient Argument to prove that the Words were not spoken of the Messiah, because they were spoken of God. And the *Socinian* Commentator observes, All the Words of the *Psalms* being manifestly spoken of the High God, and no word in the *Psalms* declaring Christ to be that God, of necessity, if these Words be apply'd unto Christ, he must be supposed to be the High God spoken of.

THE first Remark our Author makes as necessary to his intended Exposition, is, *That the Writer of the Epistle is to be understood all along from the fifth Verse to the end of the Chapter, to cite the Words of the Old Testament, as the Words of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and adds, How evident is this?* But this is so far from being evident to me, that it seems not to be true, or to hold any farther than in the fifth, sixth, and thirteenth Verses. He saith, in ver. 7. plainly signifies the Holy Ghost, or the inspired Writer of the *Psalms*; saith, as may appear to such as look into the Places whence the several remaining Passages, ver. 7, 8, 9, 10. are quoted, and the Manner of Expression is plainly alter'd; yet whether this be so or no, the Argument will not be much affected.

HE tells us, *Some of the Psalms are plainly interlutory, as Psal. xxiv.* Let this be now suppos'd, whether the Instance he gives be right or no. If any appear to be plainly so, it will be easily allowed. But will it follow, that when our Author wants, or has a mind to have it so, that this must be admitted, even where there is no plain Proof or Appearance of any such thing? Grant me what I desire, and I'll prove

prove what I please. Give him the liberty to do three things. (1.) To suppose, without the least *proof* ~~Text~~, that the 102d *Psalms* is interlocutory. (2.) That 'tis a Dialogue between the Father and Christ. And, (3.) That he may at pleasure determine what Words are spoken by the Father, and what by Jesus Christ; and then it will follow, that the Words cited in *Heb. i. 10, 11, 12.* are to be *consider'd as the Father's Answer to Christ.* This with the help of [*ἡμῶν*] *thou shalt remain*, (for [*ἡμῶν*] *thou remainest*, the common Reading both of the Septuagint and the Citation in *Heb. i.* agreeable enough to the *Hebrew*, consonant to the *Syriack*, and also to what follows [*ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς εἶ*] *thou art the same*) and the Author's Sense too put upon the Words, which is more than all the rest, gives him the assurance to conclude, that this Text *does not in the least oppose his Scheme*; and that *if others think only, that it will bear, an Argument can't be fairly fetch'd against him from it.* A wonderful Discovery! that none of the former Opposers of our Lord's Divinity dreamt of, to baffle the Argument hence, which they were intent upon, and found so necessary for their Cause, as to attempt all manner of ways to do it. In my opinion, 'tis a sufficient Prejudice against his Interpretation, at least 'tis not to be boasted of, that as it is wholly precarious, and without pretence of proof; so perfectly new, and unknown to the Christian World before, yet in a very important Article, and nearly affecting our Religion. What may we not make of the Holy Scriptures, if we scruple not to turn and wrest 'em at this rate, and presume arbitrarily to pass our Fancies and new-coined Senses upon 'em as we have occasion, or to serve a present Design.

It may suffice now farther to remark, that the whole 102d *Psalms* answers its inscribed Title, [*A Psalm of the Afflicted*] that 'tis a continued Address to the Supreme God under the Name or Title of *Jehovah*  
 K (through

(throughout the *Psalms*, except *ver. 24.*) that there appear not any Footsteps of such an interlocutory Discourse as our Author is willing to imagine ; that as the distressed Church says, *ver. 24. O my God, take me not away in the midst of my Days* ; and adds, *Thy Years are throughout all Generations* : so the Address is manifestly continued, *ver. 25. Of old, or, in the Beginning thou hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c.* And this suitable to the Expressions before in *ver. 11, 12.* that [ὁ κύριος] *Thou, O Lord*, the word by which the Greek Translation renders *Jehovah* every place in the *Psalms*, is put in, not without reason, both by the LXXII, and also by the Apostle ; yet how agreeable to our Author's Notion, that the Father should say to Christ, *Thou, O Jehovah*, he may consider : that in fine, tho his nice Suppositions should pass and be allowed, yet after all, the Creation of the World is ascribed to our Lord Jesus in such a manner, in such strong and express Terms, as make even the *Socinians*, who are seldom at a loss for subtle Evasions, to confess, that if Christ be the Person spoken of, he must be the High God. And where do we find the Almighty spoken of, or the Work of Creation attributed to him in more proper and decisive Expressions ? Nor can it be thought unwarrantable, or without good reason, that what is spoken of God in this *Psalms*, is apply'd to Christ, being consider'd here as the Redeemer and Saviour of his afflicted Church, and for that the calling of the *Gentiles* is here predicted, and the creating of a new People, which properly belongs to the Days of the Messiah, and expounded by the *Jews* in relation to the World to come, or the new State of the Church then to take place.

(5.) As for the next Argument from the Omniscience of Christ in proof of his Divinity, it will possibly be thought not of less weight and consideration from what appear'd in his Answer, which fairly



fairly examin'd. Nor will the prudent Reader the less regard what *I said on this Head*, for his calling it *slight and superficial*. 'Tis doubtless worthy of Remark, that the wisest of Men, under Conduct of Inspiration, affirms in a most solemn Address to God, *1 Kings viii. 39. Thou, even thou only knowest the Hearts of all the Children of Men*; and that the most High assumes and challenges, as his Prerogative and peculiar Glory, *Jer. xvii. 10. I the Lord search the Heart, I try the Reins, even to give every Man according to his Ways*. Now if Christ Jesus do, without any difficulty or scruple, without using the least precaution to guard against Mistake, challenge this Honour to himself, in the same Expressions, and to the same Purpose, and say, *Rev. ii. 23. All the Churches shall know, that I AM HE, which searcheth the Reins and Hearts, and I will give unto every one of you according to your Works*; how reasonable and necessary to conclude from this, in conjunction with other peculiar and distinguishing Characters of Deity, that he is God in the proper Sense?

OUR Author says, *God is able to impart the Knowledge of the Heart to others, as he did in some Cases to the Prophets*. Of this no question is made, but did ever any Prophet challenge the Prerogative of knowing Hearts, in the Expressions that are employ'd on purpose to set forth the Omniscience of God? To this he replies, *I never thought that any Prophet had that Knowledge which Christ had; why may not he that can impart the constant Knowledge of the Heart of one Man, impart the Knowledge of the Hearts of all Men?* But if the Knowledge of the Heart was imparted to the Prophets in some Cases, why might they not challenge the Prerogative in those Cases? And tho Christ's Knowledge be more full and extensive than any or all the Prophets, yet that seems not to make any difference as to the kind of it, and the manner of imparting, that being but by Revelation, or notice

from another, not by Penetration or direct Intuition. How much more proper then for him to have said, by Divine Vouchsafement 'tis given to me, to understand what is in your Hearts, this Knowledge is imparted to me by him that searches the Heart; than without hesitation to assume the appropriate Stile of the most High, and say, *I AM HE that SEARCH-ETH the Reins and Hearts?* How reasonable for him to have made some Distinction to prevent Danger of imagining, that he made too bold with the Character, and intrench'd upon the Honour of the great God? No wonder that his Disciples are embolden'd to say, *Joh. xvi. 30. Now we are sure that thou knowest all things. Acts i. 24. Thou, Lord, which knowest the Hearts of all Men. Joh. xxi. 17. Lord, thou knowest all things.* Is this their free and unlimited ascribing to the Blessed Jesus, not only the Knowledge of Hearts, but absolute Omniscience, and that in the most solemn and awful Cases, with any Decency to be compared with the Woman of Tekoah's fawning Compliment to David? *2 Sam. xiv. 17, 19, 20.* Or may we safely venture to take the Sense, and expound the Force of their most serious and considerate Expressions upon such Occasions, from those of a crafty Woman, that knew how to give flattering Titles to Princes, and call this *comparing one part of Scripture with another?* Nor can her words, however hyperbolical and fulsom, be in reason thought to signify more, than David's great Sagacity to penetrate the Designs of subtle Courtiers, and his exacter Knowledge in the Affairs of State.

THERE are nevertheless two Texts especially, wherein he imagines that our Saviour does most expressly disclaim this absolute Omniscience; *Joh. viii. 28. Ye shall know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself, but as my Father has taught me, I speak these things. And Mark xiii. 32. Of that Day and Hour knoweth no one, (or no Man) no, nor the Angels that are in Heaven; neither*

neither the Son, but the Father; or, as in *Mat. xxiv. 36.* *But my Father only.* I took what I offer'd upon this to be a pertinent and full Answer; but he tells me, *I left out the first part of the Text, and jumbled the latter part of it with another.* I shall therefore, to content him, distinctly consider each of them, which I saw not then any need to do.

As to the former, Jesus said to the Jews, *ver. 24. If ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your Sins.* They then said, *Who art thou?* He replies, *Even the same that I said unto you from the Beginning;* plainly that he was the Messiah that was to come: and adds in this *ver. 28. When ye have lift up the SON OF MAN, then shall ye know that I AM HE, and that I do nothing of myself, but as my Father hath taught me, I do these things.* How could he more explicitly declare, or what more proper Expressions could he use to signify, that he spake of himself as *Son of Man*, and *Messiah*, come to execute the Commission he had received from his Father, and that he exactly follow'd his Instructions?

'Tis urged, *What needed the Father to teach the Human Nature of Christ? Was not his Divine Nature sufficient for that?* He has the same reason to ask, why the Father is said to raise up Christ from the Dead, when yet he himself says, *Destroy this Body, and in three days I will raise it up again.* There appears not the least Inconsistency in this, when being sent of the Father, he did those things which were according to his Will, and perform'd the Duties of the Character he bare, and the Office he was vested with. So that 'tis no Impeachment of his Omnipotence as God, that under another Consideration, as Man and Messiah, he was taught of his Father, and took his Instructions from him.

As to the other Text, about which a great deal of noise has been made, *Mar. xiii. 32.* I observ'd, that Christ, as he was the Son of Man, under which

Cha-



Character he speaks here of himself, *ver. 26.* knew no more than was imparted and communicated to him. And it is not unusual in Scripture for the Man Christ Jesus to bear the Name of *Son of God*. Luke i. 35. *Therefore that Holy Thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the SON OF GOD.* Now what wonder that this Jesus, born of the Virgin, called the *Son of God*, should be ignorant of some things, then not revealed to him, or necessary to be known, when we are expressly told, *Chap. ii. 52.* that Jesus increased in Wisdom and Stature? 'To preclude, says \* *Dr. Hammond*, the Curiosity of Men, and to engage their Vigilance, Christ is pleased to tell them, that no Dispensation of God's, either by Man, *viz. Daniel*, or any other Prophet, or by Angel, or which is highest, *by the Son of Man*, had order'd us thus to know the *Times or the Seasons*; this being no part of the Prophetick Office of any Man, or within the Commission of Christ himself, to reveal this Secret to them.' This Matter being clear and plain, we need be little moved by what our Author suggests to cloud and puzzle it. Says he, *Christ was not the Father, and therefore if he knew of that Day and Hour himself, he could not consistently with Truth say, the Father only knew it.* I answer, This goes upon a wrong Supposition, that Christ cannot be God, because the Father is God; or that he is another God different from him, because he is another Person. Christ indeed was not the Father, but had God for his Father; and when he says, that his Father *only* knew the Day of Judgment, he doubtless speaks of his Father *as God*. Omniscience belongs to him not merely or properly, on the account of his being the Father of Christ, but on the account of his being God; and consequently the word *only*, cannot in reason be construed here to signify more,

---

\* In loc.

than to exclude all others from this Knowledge, that differ in Nature and Being from the Father, and are not God.

BUT *did the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, all three, know of that Day and Hour? If they did, what Truth can there be in his saying, no one but the Father knew it?* I answer, the word *Father* here cannot be understood to exclude, or stand in opposition to Word and Holy Spirit, who differ not in Nature and Knowledge from him; but distinctly denotes his Relation to the Man Christ in Union with the Word, that holy thing born of the Virgin, therefore called the *Son of God*. The Father as God knew it, and none but God.

TO *what purpose is this Observation, of his speaking of himself as the Son of Man? Does not that Term denote his whole Person in both his Natures?* I answer, Tho that Term is, or may be used, confusedly and in general, to signify his whole Person; yet it may, and sometimes does particularly and precisely denote Christ's human Nature, or the Man Christ Jesus in distinction from his Deity: and so does not always, if at all, denote expressly and distinctly the *whole* of that which belongs to the Person of Christ; that Person being a complex Subject, in which two different Natures are united. Thus the Observation is to good purpose, since what he speaks of himself, as Son of Man, may be very true with respect to his human Nature, and yet cannot be justly apply'd to his divine Nature, as was shewn before. And thus in the Instance he gives, *Joh. iii. 13. Even the Son of Man, which is in Heaven;* I see not but the Person called the Son of Man, having two distinct Natures, might be truly said to be in Heaven in respect of his divine Nature; when yet, as Son of Man, and in regard of his human Nature, he was actually upon Earth, or the Man Christ was not then locally in Heaven. Such further Queries to embarrass the matter in debate, as *Between whom does Christ mediate?*  
Did

*Did he send himself? Was he taught by himself? &c.* appear little to concern it, and are answered elsewhere.

WHEN our Author urged, that the Disciples being inquisitive to know that Day, would be ready to say, Well, Lord, if thou dost not know it as thou art Man, yet tell us as God; I thought it unworthy of his Judgment: as if when they found, that he had it not in his Power and Commission, as Son of Man, to reveal, they would be concern'd farther to importune him about it. He now insists, if they knew him to be God, \* must not his Answer be a mere Evasion, when he tells them; he did not know it as Man only? I answer, by no means; if the Man Jesus knew it not, if it had not been revealed to the Man Jesus, to whom they address'd their Inquiry in needless Curiosity, and he had no Warrant or Commission to reveal it, how could they expect or suppose he should tell it? What he subjoins is more plausible, and more worthy of Consideration; *'Tis a vastly different thing for Christ to say absolutely, he did not know the Day and Hour; (which is not true, if he knew it either as God or Man) and for him to say, tho he knew it, he had not Power or Commission, as Son of Man, to reveal it.* To which I say two things. 1. That 'tis no way unwarrantable, or inconsistent with strictest Truth, and Propriety of Speech, for the Man Christ to say absolutely, he knew not, when in truth and reality the Man Christ knew it not. 2. That this manner of Speech is not singular, and appropriate to this Place and Subject; there are other Instances of such absolute Negations, which yet must be construed and understood with such like Limitations. When our Lord says, *Joh. xvii. 11. Now I am no more in the World, I come to thee;* who imagines, that tho the Man Christ Jesus, the Son of

\* Pl. Chr. p. 47.



God, be passed into the Heavens, Heb. iv. 14. which must receive him, until the Times of Restitution of all things, Acts iii. 21. that yet Christ is so confined within the Heavens, as not, in respect of another Nature, to be really present in the World? *Where two or three are gathered together in his Name, he is present in the midst of them*, Mat. xviii. 20. The Nature and Extent of his Government and Administration is such, as necessarily demands and supposes a more general, and an effectual Presence in the World.

It appears after all, somewhat shocking, that these Gentlemen, after disowning the Omniscience of Christ, which is an essential Perfection of Deity, make so little difficulty of denying him true Humanity, or at least making him a Man of another Nature, and of a different Kind from all the Men that ever were, or ever will be. But they must be excused in this, as in many other things, which they would hardly do, but in compliance with the Necessities of a Scheme which they have espoused; and this is not denied to be one of the peculiar Opinions of *Arius*. Now what Definition does our Author give us of a Man? Says he, *I understand thereby no more than such Bodies as we have inhabited and governed by intelligent and reasonable Substances*. If he will needs understand it so, who can help it? I believe it will not be easy to find this Definition in any approved Writer. Can he prove, or is he sure, that all Spirits or intelligent Substances are of the same Kind? or that Angels do not specifically differ from human Souls? Does he find in Scripture, or elsewhere, so much as one Instance of any other intelligent Spirit animating and informing such Bodies as we have, than a human Soul? Our Lord took not on him, or united to himself the Nature of Angels; but he took the Seed of *Abraham*, it behoving him in all things to be made like unto his Brethren. But, says our Author, *two things shew how little this is to his purpose; 1. That the*

L

all

all things wherein he is said to be made like to his Brethren, is explained Heb. ii. 18. to refer to his Sufferings and Temptations. That they refer to this, will be easily granted, his Sufferings and Temptations being some of those things wherein he was made like unto us; but were these the *all things*? He durst not say this, but is obliged to add, 2. *That he was made like unto us, in his having Flesh and Blood as we have*; which is expressly mention'd in reference to his Death upon the Cross for us, tho the inspir'd Writer does not there so expressly mention his reasonable Soul, that being not the visible and immediate Subject of that Death. But must we hence conclude, that he had not such a reasonable Soul? when yet this also seems plainly imply'd; nor could he be in *all things* like unto us without it, or so truly ally'd to us as 'twas expedient for the Redeemer of Mankind to be, that being a main and most considerable part of human Nature, tho not so immediately necessary to be there directly mentioned. That he was made in *all things* like unto us, is most plainly asserted; but our Author would have it to be only in some things, excepting and excluding that, upon the account whereof chiefly we are Men. But we have had this matter already under consideration before\*.

(6.) We advance now to the sixth Argument the Letter took notice of, for the Deity of Christ, the Worship we are warranted and required by the Scripture to give him. This must be regarded as of grand Importance and Consideration in Religion. Here every Christian has an Interest at stake, and is immediately concerned. Nor is there any thing

---

\* Origen, in his Answer to Celsus, takes notice of the Words, assuming both a human Soul and Body, p. 170. Εἰ δὲ καὶ σῶμα ἔθηκεν καὶ ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπινον ἀναλαβὼν ὁ ἀθάνατος Θεὸς λόγος, καὶ τῷ κέλευσιν ἀλλαττεῖσθαι καὶ μεταπλάττεσθαι, μανθάνω ὅτι ὁ λόγος ἑδὲν μὲν πάχει ὅν πάχει τὸ σῶμα ἢ ἡ ψυχὴ.

wherein the great God appears more jealous: This Glory he will be distinguish'd by, and by no means allow to any other. Christian Religion was design'd and fitted to disgrace and root out the Idolatries, that the Nations under specious Pretences had been seduced into; to retrieve the Honour, to restore and settle the Worship of the God that made the Heavens and the Earth. How shocking! and how sad! to imagine, that the End of its Institution should be so little understood and answer'd, as that the Generality of its Professors, in a manner throughout the World, and from one Age to another, should worship an inferior and different Being, as the Supreme God! An Idolatry which the wiser Heathens could scarce be charged with! That the Reformed Churches, who so carefully, and with such a jealous Zeal, threw out the Superstitions that had crept into the Christian Worship; and after the most diligent Researches, and Concern to adjust and conform it to the Rule of Holy Scripture, should yet unanimously agree in a barefac'd Idolatry! Unhappy and fatal Mistake! after such prudent and avowed Endeavours to come to a true Understanding of the Mind of God, and establish the Purity of his Worship!

OUR Author, without the least occasion from my Defence, suggests, that such as dispute for the Deity of Christ on the Article of Worship, being *pinched with their Answer, presently run in a Circle*; whereas the truth is, if we prove that the Worship of the Supreme God belongs to him, we certainly gain our point: and if by other Arguments independent on this, we first prove him to be the Supreme God, we make no scruple to challenge for him the Worship that belongs to him as such, without danger of running into a Circle, or giving the least colour for such a Charge. 'Tis the former way of arguing that is now under Debate.



As for *Bellarmino's* first Argument for the Worship of Angels and Saints, from *Psal. xcix. 5. Worship his Footstool*, which was consider'd in answer to the Letter; our Author is pleas'd now to say, *I denied not that they were to worship at his Footstool: but the thing that I insist on is, that a religious Respect was hereby paid to the Place for God's sake.* The Expression is to me ambiguous, and I am at a loss how to understand it. If he means that the things appropriate and set apart by God's Appointment for his special Service, were to be accounted sacred, not to be prophaned and prostitute to common Use, I have no Controversy with him or *Mr. Mede* about it; but if he thinks, that because the People were to worship at his Footstool, that the Footstool therefore *itself* was to be worshipped, I see not the least ground for such a Surmise or Interpretation. As the Expression imports not any Command for paying Worship to the *Footstool*, but only an Order or Direction to worship God there, or *towards that Place*, *1 Kings viii. 30. Psal. cxxxviii. 2.* so we find not any Instance or approved Practice of such Worship.

I observ'd that our Author's Notion seem'd to state the Business of religious Worship upon the foot of a mere positive Command; so that Pagans and Papists are Idolaters only for want of God's Precept for their Worship: whereas the Scripture charges with Idolatry upon the account of doing service to them who by Nature are no Gods, *Gal. iv. 8. Rom. i. 25.*  
 —The formal Object of religious Worship is still the same, and Reason or natural Light may be sufficient to direct to it, or at least determine what is not a fit and proper Object; but the Case is different with respect to the Means and Manner of Worship, where there is room and occasion for the Direction of a particular Institution or Command. To this he replies, *I distinguish between the religious Worship, which results naturally from the Perfections of God,*  
 and

and his Relations to us, and the particular Way and Manner in which this is to be paid; the first of these cannot, the second may rest upon the foot of a mere positive Command. So far then we are agreed; but I am at a loss how to understand him in the Application of this to the Case. That we are to worship the Supreme God, does not depend merely upon a positive Command; that we are to worship him thro Christ the Mediator, or that we are to pay a subordinate Worship to Christ, which is to terminate upon the Supreme God his Father, can depend upon nothing but a mere positive Command. The whole Strength of the Answer appearing to lie in this, it may be more distinctly consider'd. We must clearly distinguish between the formal Object of Worship, and the Means and Manner of the Worship directed to that Object; or between the thing worshipped, and the way of worshipping. That God is to be worshipped, surely depends not upon a mere positive Command, but that he will be worshipped in this or the other way, where the Light of Nature is not sufficient to direct, must be learned from the Discoveries he has made of his Mind, and depends upon his positive Order. Thus particularly that he will be worshipped by a Mediator, may be well signified by his positive Precept. But could our Author imagine, that his Readers would take, *worshipping God thro Christ*, and *paying a subordinate Worship to Christ*, to be Expressions of the same Sense and Import, without his offering the least Proof of that which is the thing in question? God's People of old had his positive Command for worshipping him by Sacrifices; shall we hence infer or suppose, that a subordinate Worship was to be paid to those Sacrifices by Divine Appointment? He was willing handsomely to slide in his Notion of *paying a subordinate Worship to Christ*, which methinks we should find very plain and express Scriptures for, in a matter of so great moment, when there appears so great care every where to se-

cure

cure and appropriate religious Worship to the Almighty ; and this Business of a subordinate Worship to be paid to a new and inferiour Deity, was new and unheard of in the Church before. And one would reasonably expect, that it should be very clearly stated, and the Bounds of it carefully fix'd, to prevent Danger of mistake, and applying that Worship to Christ, which is due only to the Supreme God. Can it be said, there was no Danger of such Mistake, when the Christian World has manifestly run into it, when innumerable, after the most anxious Enquiries, have not been able to escape it ? If our Worship is to be regulated by Divine Command, what can be more express and decisive than, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve* ? No exception or allowance made for serving an inferior or subordinate God, any more than for offering Sacrifice to any such, when the *Israelites* were ordered not to sacrifice to any God, save the Lord, *Exod. xxii. 20.*

HE adds, *Which (subordinate Worship) is to terminate upon the Supreme God his Father.* But where does the Scripture plainly tell us this, or speak any thing of it ? If we must pay subordinate Worship to Christ, is he not the proper Object of that Worship ? And is it not a very different sort of Worship from that which is to be paid to the Supreme God ? If subordinate Worship belong to Christ, and he be the Object of it by his Father's Appointment, must it not properly terminate on him ? Can subordinate Worship in fair Construction and good Sense, be said to terminate upon the Supreme God, when 'tis not this, but a Worship of another nature, and a higher kind, that is to be given him thro Christ ? This to be sure he reserves and demands for himself, tho he should be supposed to allow a subordinate and lower sort of Worship to another. Nor do I see but I may worship God thro Christ, without making  
Christ



Christ the Object of my Worship, or giving him any real religious Worship at all; for 'tis one thing to be a Means of Worship designed for, and terminated upon another, and another thing to be made the Object of Worship. Whence methinks there is just occasion to doubt, whether these Gentlemen do directly and in a proper sense worship Christ himself, while they make him only the Means or Mediator of the Worship they design for, and offer to a superior Being.

As to *Pagans and Papists*, says our Author, *supposing their Worship is design'd to terminate upon the Supreme God, I think it is most true, that the only thing which makes them Idolaters, is the want of God's Precept for their Worship.* If the Apostle had thought so, it had been as easy for him to have given this as the true and only Reason of charging the *Gentiles* with Idolatry; and to have urged that they had no Command for worshipping their inferior Gods: when yet he grounds his Charge upon another bottom, as doing service to them, who by Nature were no Gods. They seem plainly to have erred in the Object of their Worship, in that they worshipped and served the Creature beside the Creator, and not only in the Manner of their Worship, this latter being properly the Subject of a positive Command, and to be regulated by it, whereas the former is of a moral and unalterable Nature. But do not the Papists plead, in excuse of the Worship they pay to Angels and Saints, that it redounds to the Honour of God, who has exalted them to a State of Dignity and Preheminence, and made them Instruments of great Good to us upon Earth? And might not this be thought to imply, and be equivalent to a positive Command of worshipping them? Yet as *St. Peter* utterly refused it when offer'd by *Cornelius*, *Acts* x. 25, 26. so when *John* fell down before the feet of the Angel to worship him, *Rev.* xxii. 8, 9. he said, *See thou do it not,*  
worship

worship God; intimating that God is the only Object of Religion, and that not so much as any outward Act of Adoration, which may be justly construed to signify and express religious Worship, can warrantably be used unto any but the Supreme God, whatever Character of Dignity or Usefulness may be put upon them, or Pretence made of terminating it upon God.

OUR Author conceives that the Israelites were guilty of Idolatry, in paying their Worship towards the Calves of Dan and Bethel, which they had not the Warrant of a positive Command for, instead of doing it towards the Temple. And if this were admitted, it alters not the Case. A positive Command might fix the Manner of Worship, while they kept to the right Object; but if they worshipped the Calves themselves, their Practice was Idolatry upon another account, as a Violation of the Moral Rule and Law of religious Worship.

As to what was offer'd from Gal. iv. 8. he says, *We do Service to him only who is by Nature God. We pay no Service but what terminates upon him, and is according to his express Command. If I hire a Servant, and engage him to quit all other Masters, and serve me only, does he act inconsistently with this Engagement, when by my Order and Appointment he serves my Child?* I answer, No; if in Attendance on a Child, he does the Service in your Family, which therefore is properly yours: but if you consign him to the Service of your Son, that has a Family and Interest of his own, he therefore acts not inconsistently with his Engagement, because this is done by Compact and mutual Consent; but his Service is then to be consider'd as transfer'd, and to be perform'd not properly and personally to you, but to your Son, whose immediate and proper Servant he is become. But religious Worship however is of another nature, due only to him who is God by Nature, and is not capable of

being

being  
thou  
Ligh  
coun  
the v  
mina  
W  
the C  
call  
whic  
dring  
Scop  
fual?  
wont  
Creat  
be he  
or th  
try,  
for th  
ment  
Who  
and se  
as Cr  
least  
not w  
Worsh  
tende  
i Cor.  
which  
beside  
constr  
as wel  
ra w  
Creat  
the Id

\* Co  
† Co

being transfer'd; nor can it be imagin'd that God should warrant any Worship by Precept, which the Light of Nature does condemn: that he should countenance or excuse from the Guilt of Idolatry, the worshipping of a Creature, on pretence of terminating the Worship on himself.

WHEREAS I render'd *Rom. i. 25.* worshipping the Creature *with or beside* the Creator, he will needs call it *attempting to mend our Translation*, (a thing which he is not wont to scruple.) But is this rendering harsh or unnatural, or inconsistent with the Scope of the Place, or so much as strange and unusual? Tho such as are addicted to Idolatry, are wont to be mad upon their Idols, and to worship the Creature *more than* the Creator, which possibly may be here intimated; yet this is not the formal Reason, or the proper Ground of charging Men with Idolatry, but their setting up another, or a false Object for their Worship, in the room of the only true one, mention'd partly before *ver. 23.* more fully here, *Who changed the Truth of God into a Lye, and worshipped and served the Creature beside the Creator*; opposing God as Creator to all Creatures whatsoever, without the least notice of any middle or other Being, that comes not within the compass of this Distinction, to which Worship might be due. Nor is it so much as pretended that [παρά] may not well be so rendred, as *i Cor. iii. 11.* [παρὰ τὸν κείμενον] *than or beside that which is laid.* *Gal. i. 8, 9.* [παρ' ὃ παραλάβετε] *than or besides which ye have received, &c.* As *Athanasius* constructs it to this Sense, \* observing that the *Arians* as well as the *Gentiles* [τῇ κτίσει λατρεύουσιν παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα τὰ πάντα θεόν] worship the Creature *beside* God the Creator of all things: so † *Origen* also, speaking of the Idolatry of the *Persians* in worshipping the Sun

\* Contra Arianos, Oratione quarta.

† Contra Celsum, lib. 7.



and the Creatures of God, adds, [ἀπερ ἡμῖν ἀπεγορεύεται, διὰ σκοπέου μὴ λατρεύειν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα] which is forbidden us, who are taught not to serve the Creature *besides* or *together with* the Creator. ‘Dr. Whitby upon the place notes, in the 23d Verse, they are charged only with false Representations of God, in this also with a false Object of their Worship, by giving the Divine Honour to a Creature.’

OUR Author might very well suppose, *that I will not say, the Light of Nature condemns the worshipping God by a Mediator*; but when he adds, *nor can I conceive how we can worship God by a Mediator, without paying some kind of Worship to the Mediator*, I want to be inform’d what kind of *Worship* that is, since with me all Religious Worship is appropriate to God. When I pray to God thro the Mediator, I do not address that Prayer to the Mediator, accounting that so it will terminate upon God; but making God the Object of my Worship, I am encouraged to hope that my Prayer will meet with acceptance on the Mediator’s account, or by means of his Merit and Intercession. But he would ask Mr. Moore, *if he worship Christ as Supreme God, whether he worship him thro a Mediator? Will he assert that he mediates with himself?* Let us but draw this Matter out of its affected Obscurity, and the seeming Difficulty, so frequently objected by him, ceases. *There is one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus*; now when we come to God, or worship him by this Mediator, we make use of him as our High Priest to bring us to God, or into Acceptance with him. In this Office we consider him, first, as making Reconciliation, by dying as a Sacrifice; and then passing into the Heavens for ever to make Intercession. In dependence on the Vertue and Efficacy hereof, we make our Addresses to God for Grace and Blessings, and hope that our Worship and Services will be accepted; yet this regard to his Mediation is not properly worshipping him, tho it

has

has  
as M  
Chri  
unde  
Libe  
by th  
the M  
rectly  
in ex  
be pr  
rit, v  
and c  
fame  
H  
say,  
sure,  
addre  
ly Sp  
Wor  
penfa  
mark  
who  
with  
I anf  
Reas  
Direc  
Wor  
think  
tion,  
a Mi  
and I  
Tem  
by th  
Error  
denn  
ship  
due  
him

has its weight and value from his being God as well as Man. If besides, I address Acts of Worship to Christ as God, I think it no Incongruity to do it, under the Consideration and Encouragement of that Liberty of Access, and assured Acceptance, we have by the Blood of the Cross; yet it cannot be said that the Man Christ does mediate with himself, but directly with God the Father, tho not separately and in exclusion of the Word and Spirit. If the Father be propitiated and reconciled, the Son also and Spirit, who were jointly offended by Sin, must of course and consequence be reconciled likewise, being of the same Nature and Will with the Father.

HENCE 'tis very agreeable to my Sentiment to say, what it seems our Author *took notice of with pleasure*, that the Gospel directs to the worshipping and addressing the Father, thro Jesus Christ, by the Holy Spirit; and this common Method of Christian Worship is congruous and suited to the known Dispensation of Grace. Upon this he makes two Remarks. (1.) *If this be true, what reason can those have, who are of Mr. Moore's opinion, to break Communion with such as confessedly comply with the Gospel-Direction?* I answer, There may be other just and necessary Reasons for a separate Communion, even where this Direction, at least in a loose and general Form of Words, is comply'd with. And good Men may think they have reason to be exempted from Imposition, and to be excused from joining statedly under a Ministry, and in a Communion, where themselves and Families are like to be continually in the way of Temptation, and in danger of being practised upon by the Artifices of such as would draw them into Error; where their Faith and Practice shall be condemn'd as Idolatrous; where the Honour and Worship which they believe in their Consciences to be due to the Lord that bought them, and to be paid him by Divine Appointment in the Assemblies of



Christians, is professedly deny'd him; where they shall want some special Means of being establish'd and built up in their Faith, and Hope, and Joy: And all this without necessity, when they may comfortably settle in a Communion, where with one Mind and one Heart, with Words of Truth, and with united Affections, they may worship the Father thro Christ, and also call upon the Lord Jesus, and pay him their Vows and Homage as their Saviour and their God, and safely use all the proper Methods for their Edification and Furtherance. (2.) He says, *But how is it that we are to worship the Father through Christ? Is it not by a Trust in the Mediation of Christ? And is not that Trust in him as dying? Can we trust in him as dying, without trusting in him AS MAN?* I answer, This Matter has been clear'd a little before. It may be now added, that we consider Christ's Death as a grand Motive and Encouragement to our Trust, and a Ground of it; but we take the Mediator, who died as Man, to be God as well as Man: we believe that God laid down his Life for us\*, that God redeemed the Church with his own Blood†, that unless his Divinity had given value to his Death, it had not been sufficient for the Redemption of a lost World, or a sufficient Foundation for our Hope and Trust. Tho the Death of Christ therefore, which he suffer'd in the Nature of Man, be a special Argument for our Trust in him; yet he is not *as Man* the proper Object of our Trust, but *as God*: nor can our Trust in him be construed in any Propriety of Speech, as *an Act of subordinate Worship*.

WHEREAS our Author, p. 55. argues, that if Christ be *acknowledged as Mediator to be a subordinate Power, and is to be worshipped as Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus sharing in the Honour and Worship that is*

\* 1 Joh. iii. 16.

† Acts xx. 28.



given to him, this Worship must necessarily be subordinate and inferior Worship: There might be some colour for this, were the formal Reason of worshipping the Mediator acknowledged to be the subordinate Power he has received; but since we believe the Mediator to be God manifested in Flesh, and worship this Person under no other formal Consideration, but as such, we are safe as to the Object of our Worship, while as Mediator in the Exercise of a subordinate Power, he gives motive and occasion, and brings us under peculiar Obligations to do him homage. Thus the Worship we give to Christ the Mediator, differs from that which we give to God absolutely consider'd, and to God the Father, not in respect of its Nature, but of its peculiar Motives and Manner of Expression.

I observ'd, that it was no other than subordinate Worship which the Devil had the Impudence to ask of Christ, acknowledging that his Power and Dominion was but derived and subordinate: *Luke iv. 6. It is deliver'd unto me.* He replies, *Why may not our Lord's Answer be thus understood, that by God's Command he only is to be worshipped; and my worshipping thee can be no worshipping him, and therefore contrary to his Command?* In return to which I say, (1.) If by God's Command he himself is only to be worshipped, must it not be contrary to his Command (as well as to Reason) to worship any other besides him? And how then can worshipping another be worshipping him, when he has expressly forbid the worshipping any other? (2.) If our Lord had thought a subordinate Worship allowable, and that it might be lawfully given to a subordinate Power, as redounding to the Glory of the Supreme; had it not been most natural for him, in confutation of the Devil's Claim, to say, *Thou art a Lyar, there's no such Power and Dominion delivered unto thee as thou pretendest, and therefore thou hast no right to be worshipped?* But he answers

swers him in such a manner, as to bar his Pretensions to Worship, tho' what he alledged had been even true, that such a subordinate Power had been given him; plainly signifying, that 'tis contrary to the Rights and Command of the Supreme God, to give religious Worship to any other, even under pretence and on account of a delegated and subordinate Power. So neither Angels, nor Saints, nor any pretended inferior Deities can lawfully be worshipped under the Notion of subordinate Powers.

I shewed that religious Worship, as importing a Subjection of Soul to the Being we address it, is due only to God, who alone has a Right and immediate Access to it; That besides worshipping God by the Mediator, we are directly to worship Jesus Christ himself, to devote ourselves, to submit our Wills and Consciences to him as our rightful Owner and Sovereign Lord, as being our Creator, Redeemer, and Saviour. He replies, *A Subjection of Soul can be originally and absolutely due to none but God; but that God cannot communicate such Perfections to another, or entrust him with such a full Power and Authority, as that Persons shall be bound to express this Subjection to himself, by the Subjection of their Souls to such a qualified and authorized Person, is what is denied; and that Christ has a Claim to us under any other Consideration than the Father's Agent.* Besides what has been already offer'd against this fond and groundless Notion, which the Scripture nowhere mentions; if this Worship can be *originally* due to none but God, methinks we should not venture to give it to another, unless assured upon the most certain and indubitable Grounds, that he had so far parted with his Right, as to make it another's by Derivation, when yet he has expressly told us, that he will not give his Glory to another.

NOR can I understand, how Subjection of Heart and Conscience should be with Reserve and Limitation, and not *absolute*, when this is the utmost I have

to

to  
lut  
An  
tha  
dee  
Tr  
I m  
wh  
of  
self  
and  
ther  
I see  
to a  
pose  
fy'd  
Hom  
can  
ting  
the  
pend  
ture  
N  
or D  
culty  
as Ag  
for hi  
a Prin  
the  
Right  
Maste  
der a  
is it  
most  
to be  
pect h  
Servan  
That



to give ; and know not what greater or more absolute Homage the Most High can demand or expect. And what greater Obligations can I possibly have than to him who made me, has preserved and redeemed me, and upon whom is my Dependence and Trust for eternal Salvation and Felicity? Content I must needs be to resign myself absolutely to him, who does all this for me. How reasonable that none of us should live to himself, and no Man die to himself ; that *whether we live, we should live to the Lord, and whether we die, we should die to the Lord, since whether we live or die, we are the Lord's?* For my part, I see not what more absolute Homage can be given to any, or what more required. How can we suppose another vested with such a Trust, to be so qualify'd, and in such Authority, as to demand this Homage, without intercepting the Regards which can be due only to God ? What Danger of forgetting him, if we are thus left in the hands, and unto the disposal of another ? The Obligation and Dependence seem too great and boundless for any Creature or subordinate Power.

NOR does the saying that Christ is God's Agent or Deputy, obviate the Danger, or lessen the Difficulty. If a Steward receives Homage of a Tenant, as Agent for the Lord of the Fee, shall he demand for himself any part of the Service promised ? When a Prince marries by Proxy, who does imagine that the Proxy may lawfully challenge a share in the Rights of the Marriage, wherein he was but his Master's Deputy ? If *Christ has not a Claim to us under any other Consideration than the Father's Agent*, how is it that the Scripture warrants and requires the most solemn and proper Acts of religious Worship to be directed to Christ himself ? Might we not expect he should say, See that ye do it not, I am but a Servant, I am but my Father's Agent, worship God ? That he was a Servant, and an Agent, is readily confessed ;



confessed ; but that he was but a Servant and an Agent, and nothing more, and that Worship is due to him under no other Consideration, cannot be allow'd, against the plainest Declarations of Scripture, which still sets him forth as *God, over all, blessed for evermore*. And it was observed, that he does not merely as an Agent or Ambassador, but as a Sovereign demand Obedience, and proclaim Peace and Pardon to rebellious Subjects.

WE proceed then to the four things that were urged in the Defence, for giving direct Divine Worship to Jesus Christ.

(I.) IN general we are directed to honour the Son even as we honour the Father ; *He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father that sent him*, Joh. v. 23. 'Tis a tender point, and of the last consequence, to give due Honour and Worship to the Son. If we refuse or neglect to do this, the Father accounts not himself honour'd, nor will be pleased with the Respect and Worship we pretend to yield him. The Expression here seems manifestly, and upon first view, to denote an equal, or at least the same kind of Sacred and Divine Worship, to be given to the Son, with that which is given to the Father ; and to give him another kind of Honour, is not to honour him at all, even as we honour the Father.

I had occasion to take notice \*, that the word [*καθὼς, as*] in *Mat. v. 48.* as in many other places, *can* denote but a Resemblance or Similitude ; and our Author is willing to *believe that this is one of those many other places* : If then he can make it appear that it *can* here denote no other, and that there is like necessity of construing it to this Sense, as in the place I mentioned, it will readily be admitted ; but till then, it ought in reason to be left to its proper Force and Signification. He thinks that *the foregoing*

\* Def. p. 19.

*words quite overthrow the Inference drawn from this Text :* The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son, that all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. *And can that Honour, which is the consequence of the Father's Grant, be equal to the Honour which is due to the Father, who makes the Grant, and for whose sake the Honour is to be paid?* If he means here, (else the Remark signifies nothing to his purpose) that the Honour to be given to the Son is *merely* the Consequence of the Father's Grant, and *merely* for his sake, without respect to the Dignity of his Person ; he not only takes civilly for granted, what is utterly deny'd, but what can by no means be *drawn* as a just Inference from the foregoing words. Were not Christ God in our Nature, he would neither be capable of so great a Trust, nor of the Honour that attends it. That the Government of the World is by Dispensation and Agreement devolved on him, that all Judgment is committed to him, and left in his hand ; is so far from being a reason for a lesser and inferior sort of Honour to be given him, that 'tis a plain and convincing Proof, and certain Ground for honouring him, even as we honour the Father.

THE Father's Right to Divine Worship was establish'd and acknowledg'd before ; but the Son's appearing in the Likeness of sinful Flesh, and in the Form of a Servant, might be thought such a Diminution of his native Glory, as that Men might be apt (as we find they still are) to yield him but a lower kind of Respect and Honour, than what is confessed to be the Father's Due : wherefore the sole Administration of things in the World, and in the Church, is entrusted with him, that instead of losing by his Condescension and Abasement, he might hereby come to have the same Honour distinctly paid him, as is given to the Father, under distinct and peculiar Motives. Thus the Father's committing

all Judgment to the Son is not *here*, as he supposes, made the *formal Reason* of that Honour that is paid to him, but a special Argument and Consideration moving to it, and enforcing it. And this Authority is consign'd to him, or given him, not AS, but BECAUSE he is the Son of Man; for merely *as Man*, he could not exercise such a Power, and it was not fit he should suffer a Diminution of his just Honour, by becoming Man. Because therefore of his Incarnation, and his becoming the Son of Man, he had Authority yielded or given him to execute Judgment also. Thus tho he appeared in the Fashion of a Man, the *Jews* might be convinced, that he was not guilty of a Crime in making himself equal with God, and challenging the same Honour that is to be paid to the Father, *ver. 18, &c.*

I had said, and shall we come off with this Pre-  
tence, that we honour Christ Jesus truly, tho not  
with the same or like kind of Honour with the Fa-  
ther? Must we not truly honour our Rulers? And  
which of them, nay, which of the glorious Angels  
has God at any time commanded, that we should ho-  
nour even as we honour himself? He answers, *'Tis  
obvious earthly Rulers are fallible, a Reserve is necessary  
to be made; yet I hope they are truly to be honour'd,  
tho not obey'd without Reserve.* He adds, that I  
laid not the Stress where I ought, upon the Universality of  
the Dominion of the Son.—Now there is no Ruler  
whom God has made it the Duty of all Men to obey. Nor  
indeed did I lay the Stress upon that, or take the  
question to be, whether *some*, or *all* Men, were to  
obey Christ; but whether *all* Men were to honour  
him with the like or same Honour which they pay to  
the Father.

(2.) The next Argument taken from prostrate A-  
doration, and solemn Ascription of Glory, by the  
whole Church, to Christ Jesus jointly with the Fa-  
ther, *Rev. v. 11, 12, 13.* is briefly answer'd, that Christ

is



is there consider'd as the Lamb, and as slain; and consequently if it proves any thing, it proves too much: which goes upon the Supposition that he is there worshipped but as the Lamb, and as slain, or solely upon this account; whereas that is not to be consider'd as the principal Ground and formal Reason, but as a most proper Inducement, and obliging Motive to the rendering him a distinct and peculiar Worship. He who appear'd as a Lamb slain, with the Memorials of his Death, was yet to be regarded as God, or ceased not to be, God over all blessed for ever.

(3.) That Jesus Christ is to be worshipped by direct and solemn Invocation, he says, *he makes no doubt*; but as I see not how any but the great God can well be complimented with this Honour, so nor that his reason for allowing it to Christ is sufficient, or such as implies *no doubt* in him, who only says, *I see not how we can come to God by him as a Mediator, without somewhat of this nature.* Our Author does not tell us what he means by *somewhat of this nature*; but I take direct and solemn Invocation to be a thing very different from *coming to God by him as Mediator*: for 'tis God himself we make our Address and Prayer to, while we hope to be heard and accepted thro' the Death and Intercession of Christ: but we do not only pray to God, and come to him by the Mediator, but the Scripture warrants our praying unto Christ himself: The Practice of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9, 10. 1 Thess. iii. 11, 12. 2 Thess. ii. 16. —iii. 16. The Practice of Christians, by which they are described, Acts ix. 14, 21. 1 Cor. i. 2, &c. However, our Author intimates an Inclination to understand with Dr. Hammond the words 1 Cor. i. 2. [*τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου*] who call upon the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, not to signify *their calling upon his Name*, but their being called by his Name. And whereas Dr. Whitby has quoted several Places from the Septuagint to show that this Phrase is not so used in their

Translation; he thinks the first mentioned by him, Gen. iv. 26. [οὗτος ἤλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου] may be translated, *He hoped to be called by the Name of the Lord.* Now tho it might possibly bear this Sense in this one place, which is neither so natural, nor so agreeable to the *Hebrew*, the other appears to be the constant Meaning in a great number of places where the LXXII use it \*; and when they express that which our Author mentions, they alter the Phrase, as † Isa. iv. 1. *Let us be called by thy Name*, [τὸ ὄνομα τὸ σὸν κεκαλήσεται ἡμεῖς] the same difference is observed in the New Testament, as *Acts* vii. 59. compared with *Acts* xv. 17.

As for *Joel* ii. 32. apply'd without hesitation to Christ, *Rom.* x. 13. he says, *Where is the Absurdity of supposing the Father to be this Lord of all, whose Name is called upon?* I answer, in that the Supposition agrees not with the Apostle's Argument, who in the whole Chapter treats of Faith in Christ, who is the *Foundation that is laid in Zion*, *Rom.* ix. 33. from *Isa.* xxviii. 16. so interpreted 1 *Pet.* ii. 6, 7. *Whosoever believeth in him shall not be ashamed*, ver. 11. In proof of this the Apostle adds, ver. 13. from *Joel* ii. 32. (which manifestly refers to the Time of the Messiah, and the Calling of the Gentiles) *For whosoever shall call upon*

\* For Satisfaction the Reader may consult for [ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τὸ θεοῦ] Gen. iv. 26. —xiii. 4. —xxvi. 25. 1 Chr. xvi. 8. Psal. lxxix. 6. —lxxx. 18. —xcix. 6. —cv. 1. —cxvi. 4, 13. Isa. lxiv. 7. Jer. x. 25. Lam. iii. 55. Joel ii. 32. Zach. xiii. 9. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ 1 Kings xviii. 24, 25, 26. 2 Kings v. 11. Psal. cxvi. 17. ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματι κυρίου Gen. xii. 8. —xxi. 33. ὅτι κηλεύσεται τὸν θεόν Gen. xxxiii. 20. 1 Chron. iv. 10. Amos iv. 12. Jonas i. 6. [τὸν κύριον] 1 Sam. xii. 17, 18. 2 Sam. xxii. 4, 7. 1 Kings xvii. 21. Psal. xiv. 4. —xviii. 3, 6. —liiii. 4. —cxviii. 5. [αὐτὸν] Psal. cxlv. 18. —cxlvii. 9. [σε] 1 Kings viii. 43, 52. 2 Chron. vi. 33. Psal. lvi. 9. —lxxxvi. 5. —cii. 2. —cxxxviii. 3. Isa. lv. 5. Lam. iii. 57. [με] Psal. lxxxii. 7. Prov. i. 28. Psal. l. 15. Jer. xi. 14. † And many other places. See Dr. Whitby's Note on 1 Cor. i. 2.

*the Name of the Lord, shall be saved; saying further, ver. 14. How then shall they call upon him, in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard? That is, How shall they call on, and believe in Christ Jesus, who have not heard of him, unto whom he has not been preached and made known; since 'tis not by Nature, but by Revelation only, that we come to the Knowledge of him?*

HE grants, we may not address our Prayers directly to any other but him, who is the Object of our Faith and Trust; but supposes *our Faith and Trust must be subordinate to that, which we are to place in God, since by Christ we believe in God, that raised him from the Dead, and gave him Glory, that our Faith and Hope might be in God, 1 Pet. i. 21.* And who doubts that God's raising Christ from the Dead, and advancing him to Glory, is a grand Encouragement to Faith and Hope in God, or is a sufficient Reason for us to believe and hope, that he will forgive our Sins, and bestow eternal Life upon us? But besides believing in God *by Christ*, that is, *by what he has done for us*, and still does in Heaven, we are also distinctly to believe in him, and make him the Object of our Faith and Hope. Not a word here, that I see, of subordinate Faith and Trust, only a special Argument and Direction for our Faith.

(4.) I urged that Christ is also the proper or supreme Object of Religion, as that signifies a Devotedness to the Service and Glory of him, whom we worship. This is express'd in the common Profession and Practice of Christians, according to Engagement in the solemn Rite of Baptism, *Rom. xiv. 7, 8, 9. Whether we live, we live unto the Lord, &c.* importing, as hath been shown, the highest Respect and Homage we are able to pay. Neither can I understand how Christ should have a Right to this, and demand it, *by the sole Gift of the Father*, without consideration of the



the Dignity of his Person ; or that, as a *Being inferior to the Father*, he should be capable of such a Gift, as proper, tho' call'd a *subordinate Worship*. But this Matter has been sufficiently discuss'd before ; and if there had been room for such a Distinction, and for worshipping an inferior Being, that by Nature is not God ; it had been as easy for the Scripture to make it, and settle the bounds of subordinate Worship ; nay, it had been necessary to be most express and plain, in so important a case : whereas it is not only silent about it, but uses the greatest precaution to prevent the worshipping any other, but the Lord our God only.

NOR is there just ground or pretence for calling the Service we do to Christ, as God over all, subordinate Worship, because this is to the *Glory of the Father* : It is doubtless to the Glory of Christ, or matter of Glory to him, that by him we do believe in God. As the divine Persons delight in glorifying each other, so in honouring the Son we honour the Father also, and in paying Honour to the Father, according to the Gospel-Institution, we likewise honour the Son ; but in one and the other we truly worship God, and set not up an inferior Being, or any Creature, as the Object of our religious Service.

As for *Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11.* That the Father has exalted the Man Christ, the Mediator, and given him a Name above every Name, and that this is unto the Glory of God the Father, we most readily grant ; a *very material* Objection, it seems, with our Author, which serves him upon all Occasions : but that this is the sole ground of the Worship we are to pay to the Son of God, we utterly deny. It was not fit that he should lose by his Incarnation and Sufferings, in consequence of which, all Judgment is committed to him, and the Government of the World solely entrusted in his Hands, that he may receive the Homage due to him, as our Creator and sovereign Lord, and

and all Men may honour him, even as they honour the Father. But he asks, *If Christ had an original Right to the Government of the World, how comes this Right to be given him of the Father?* I answer, 'Tis not his original Right, as God, that is the subject of the Father's Gift, but the Right he has, and the Power he exercises, as Mediator, which is of a different consideration, and is managed in a different manner, and to different purposes. He adds, *If he had such an original Right, he could have no need that it should be committed to him to be exercis'd in our Nature; this would continue with him, when he took upon him our Nature, without any Gift at all, and he must have a Right to the immediate Exercise of this Power.* I answer, He could not have the immediate Exercise of such Power, in quality of Mediator, and the Administration of all Things in the Dispensation of Grace, or mediatorial Kingdom, but in consequence of his undertaking and performing the Work of a Mediator, to be done in our Nature; so the sole Administration and Exercise of governing Power in the Hands of the Mediator, may well be by the Gift and Appointment of the Father. *Why do we never read of the Holy Ghost's giving him this Power, as well as the Father?* Answ. Because there was no occasion, his Consent and Concurrence being included in the Father's Will; and because not so congruous to the known Order among the divine Persons: besides, that the Holy Ghost condescends to a distinct Office and Work in the Dispensation of Grace, while the Son is the sole Mediator, and has all Judgment committed to him. *And why does the Apostle make the Glory of God, even the Father, the ultimate End of it, and not the Glory of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?* Answ. He does not this any farther, than that observed Order (without Inequality in Nature) seems to require; nor does he do this in opposition to the Son and Holy Ghost, so as at all to bar or exclude their joint Interest and Share  
in

in the Glory, as Persons in the same Deity, tho' not the Father.

(7.) WE are come to the seventh Argument for the Divinity of Christ, which our Author thought fit to mention, the holy Ordinance of Baptism, always reckon'd an important Part of Christian Worship, wherein Homage is particularly paid to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as in the Business of our Salvation, acting under distinct Characters, and condescending to assume distinct Offices. And whereas I took notice, that the Form of Administration has been always observ'd with great care in the Church, as signifying the peculiar Faith of Christians, and a solemn Covenant Transaction, &c. the Persons baptiz'd, recognizing their joint Interest, do professedly dedicate and devote themselves to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, &c. He thinks *he is under no Obligation to deny it, confessing, that this, or somewhat of this nature, seems to be the design of the Words.* This being agreed, I need not quarrel with him about what led him to express himself in the way that he did, from 1 Cor. i. 12, 13, 14, 15. *that to baptize in the Name of another, imports the entring him into that Religion, of which he is the Founder, or primary Teacher.* This, he adds, *Mr. Moore has nothing to say to:* As if I apprehended it to be unanswerable, because I thought it very little to the Purpose. The truth is, I do not well understand his meaning in the Expression, or how he infers what he seems to aim at from this Place. The Apostle condemning the Divisions that were at Corinth, says, *Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucify'd for you? or were you baptized in the Name of Paul? I thank God, that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say, that I had baptized in my own Name.* Intimating, that they could not be rightfully baptized in the Name of any other but him, who was their rightful Owner and Lord; that Christ having been crucify'd for them, and having redeem'd and bought them with the Price of his

OWN



own Blood, they were under a certain and everlasting Obligation, to devote and dedicate themselves to his Service and Glory, and not to any other, who had no such Right to challenge this. As for himself, tho' he were an infallible Teacher of Christ's Religion, yet he could not, without Impiety, have presum'd to baptize in his own Name. When therefore our Author tells us, *To baptize in the Name of another, plainly there signifies the making Persons his Disciples; and accordingly the Import of the Baptismal Form; that Men thereby are made the Disciples of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*: It may be admitted in this true Sense, (intended in the Words of Baptism) That Men professedly dedicating and devoting themselves to the Service and Glory of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, whose they are, by an acknowledg'd Right, do engage to live suitably, according to the Gospel, as the certain Rule of their Faith and Practice. Disciples are to be made for him alone, and to be baptized into his Name, whose own the Sheep are; but that any are allow'd to make Disciples, and to baptize in the Name of any, to another Purpose, and in another Sense, I find not.

"TIS altogether needless therefore for him to ask, *And is not the whole Christian Religion a thing great enough to be the Subject-Matter of the Baptismal Form?* I answer, Yes, without doubt, as this imports an absolute Devotedness to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the Gospel-Institution; an Homage profess'd to be yielded in Baptism to the Son and Holy Ghost, as well as to the Father. But if something lower and of another kind had been intended by the Baptismal Form, it had been easy for the Scripture so to have express'd it, as to obviate the common Mistake of the Christian World, in such a solemn Ordinance of constant Use and Practice.

OUR Author seems to place some Weight in *that the Israelites are said to have been baptized into Moses,*

O

(or,

(or, as render'd in our Bibles, *unto Moses*) 1 Cor. x. 2. *for explaining of the Phrase in the Baptifmal Form.* The truth is, the Expression is not the same with that in the Baptifmal Form, and fignifies little to the explaining of it; but upon fuppoſition, that 'tis equivalent, and of like import, which yet he does not prove: Beſides [*εις τὸν Μωϋσῆν*] may be render'd, *by Moses*, as it is by *Beza*, and the *Geneva Italian Translation*; or, as he obſerves, by the *Syriac* and *Arabick*, *by the Hand*, or by the *Ministry of Moses*. Thus *Acts* vii. 53. Who receiv'd the Law [*εις διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων*] by the Diſpoſition or *Ministry of Angels*; the ſame ſeeming to be ſignify'd by the vulgar *Latin*, and the *French Translation*, *in Moyſe*, *en Moyſe*; or to the ſame Senſe which ſome give of the Phrase, *unto Moses*, *Moyſe Duce*, under the conduct of *Moses*, whom God had given them for a Leader, as a Type of Chriſt, the great Saviour of his People: ſo 'tis not unuſual for ſome things to be ſpoken of the Type, which really and properly belong only to him, who is typify'd and represented. The *Iſraelites* were to paſs through the Wilderneſs unto *Canaan*, under the conduct of *Moses*; Chriſt is the great Captain of our Salvation, to lead us ſafely through this World to Glory in the next: Him God gave ample Teſtimony to, by the Miracles of the Cloud and *Red Sea*; hence *Exod.* xix. 9. the Lord ſaid to *Moses*, *I come unto thee in a thick Cloud*,—*that the People may believe thee for ever*; a like Phrase in the *Hebrew* with what our Author mentions, *Exod.* xiv. 31. *The People believ'd the Lord, and his Servant Moses, or the Lord ſpeaking by Moses*; which yet methinks can't well be compar'd with that of Chriſt, *John* xiv. 1. *Ye believe in God, believe alſo in me.* Ye already believe in God, I require, and 'tis neceſſary, that ye believe alſo in me.

But though we ſhould take the Expression, *unto Moses*, to denote, unto the Religion which *Moses* taught, and was the Miniſter of, as *Moses* is ſome-time

tin  
no  
Iſr  
wh  
fec  
of  
dec  
Ch  
feſſ  
and  
bee  
of  
ſole  
Go  
by  
wit  
feſſ  
A  
fore  
Ang  
are  
Per  
of B  
is cl  
may  
uſed  
Form  
Mr.  
As  
lemn  
prop  
Con  
tion  
a ſol  
Wor  
Devo  
men  
he ac

times put for the Law of *Moses*, *Acts* xv. 21. I see not that any thing more can be meant, than that the *Israelites* being enter'd by Baptism into the Religion, which God gave by *Moses*, they thereby became consecrate and devoted to the alone Service and Worship of *Jehovah*, their Redeemer: Nor were they by this dedicated to the Service and Honour of *Moses*, as Christians, by the Rite of Baptism, come under professed Engagement to live to Christ, as consecrate and devoted to his Will and Glory: I only add, it had been more to the Purpose, if there had been a Form of Baptism, or Circumcision, instituted, to be still solemnly used in the Church of *Israel*, in the Name of God and *Moses*; or to have had the Name of *Moses*, by a settled Ordinance, indifferently and conjunctly with the Name of the Most High, put upon the Professors of the *Jewish* Religion.

As for the Words, *1 Tim.* v. 21. I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels; wherein with great Solemnity the Elect Angels are joined with God and Christ; Will any considerate Person take this to be a parallel Case with that of Baptism? However, our Author thinks the Matter is clear as he stated it, that in a solemn Act, other Persons may be joined with the Supreme God, and the Expression be used as indifferently concerning them, as in the Baptismal Form, concerning the three Persons mentioned in it: Let Mr. Moore, says he, try if he can find a Difference. As if any body could be at a loss to find, that a solemn Charge given to a Minister, in the presence of proper Witnesses, who are strict Observers of his Conduct, and therefore may be indifferently mention'd in that quality, is a very different thing from a solemn Act of Religion, or Ordinance of Divine Worship, expressing the most entire Subjection and Devotedness, refer'd indifferently to Three, jointly mention'd, as the proper Object of it. And whereas he adds, *Besides I shew'd from the very Institution, that our*



*Saviour asserts his Authority was given him, and consequently it must be inferior to that of the Giver : I answer, That when Christ Jesus says, Mat. xxviii. 18, 19. All Power is given unto me ; go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c. he mentions this Power as the ground of sending his Apostles forth on this Design, and not as the direct and only Reason of baptizing in his Name : though considering his Claim as Creator and Redeemer, he might very well alledge the Authority given him as Mediator, to demand the acknowledgment of his Right ; nor does the Father's Grant, or Cession of Power to him, as Mediator, to be sole Administrator of the Mediatorial Kingdom, at all prejudice, but rather recommend his antecedent Right, as God over all. And so 'tis farther here to be remark'd, that we argue not for the Divinity of Christ, meerly from the Form of Baptism, which yet is of great Weight ; but in conjunction with, and consonant to many other plain and certain Proofs, which we find of it in the Scriptures, and which give light to this.*

(8.) THE last Argument for the Deity of Christ, which our Author took notice of, is taken from *Phil. ii. 5, 6, 7. Let this Mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the Form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant. He pleases himself here with a critical Observation upon the Word [but] in the beginning of the seventh Verse, as an Argument that the Apostle's Meaning is not justly express'd in our Translation : That the Words might run smooth, it should have been [yet.] Now to justify the Sense, I observ'd, that the [ἀλλὰ] may be render'd [yet] as in 1 Cor. viii. 6. our Author himself renders it ; or if it be render'd [but] the plain Meaning is, as the Learned Dr. Hammond (of sufficient critical Skill in these Matters) judges, ' He was God, and without ' any injury equal to his Father ; but for all this,*

' or

‘ or notwithstanding this, he vilified himself,’ &c. Thus our Translators, secure of the Sense in both Texts, as sufficiently manifest to any prudent Reader, content themselves to render it [*but.*] However, our Author thinks it worth while farther to refine upon this Criticism, and *questions whether* [ἀλλὰ] *can be render’d* [yet,] *unless when ’tis a Redditive to* [εἰ, or ἄπερ] *or some such word, challenging me to produce an Example, where* [ἀλλὰ] *alone, as is the Case in Phil. ii. 7. does ever signify* [yet,] *supposing in the mean time this part of his Answer to stand in its full Strength.* If then I shew that it does, I hope it will satisfy. And tho I think no great weight is to be laid upon his Remark, and that it is but precarious; yet to humour him, I would take notice, that I have observed, not only in several of the best Greek Writers, but also in several places of the LXX’s Translation, and of the New Testament, that [ἀλλὰ] is to be constructed to this Sense, and render’d accordingly, tho neither [εἰ, nor ἄπερ] go before. For instance, 1 Sam. xv. 30. Saul said, [ἡμάρτηκα, ἀλλὰ δόξασόν με] I have sinned, yet honour me now, I pray thee, before the Elders of my People. Rom. v. 13, 14. For until the Law, Sin was in the World, but Sin is not imputed where there is no Law, [ἀλλ’ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος] nevertheless, Death reigned from Adam to Moses. 1 Cor. viii. 7. [ἀλλ’ ἐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γινώσις] Howbeit, there is not in all that Knowledge. Rev. ii. 4, 14, 20. [ἀλλ’ ἐχω κατὰ σὺν] nevertheless, notwithstanding, I have somewhat against thee. Since then the words *run smooth*, and the Sense is clear in this Construction, the main Difficulty objected against our Translation of the words [ἐχ’ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγόρευε] *He thought it no Robbery*, is removed; the only Argument, which, in Dr. Hammond’s account, made another Interpretation any way probable. As for Heliodorus, whose Authority is urged against our Translation, it can at last signify little or nothing, when ’tis manifest he does not make use of the same Phrase,

Phrase, but [*ἄρπαγμα ποιεῖν*], and [*ἐπιήλυτο*], and once [*ἄρπαγμα ἡγείναι*] which yet well agrees with the Supposition, that [*ἄρπαγμος*] properly signifies the *Act* of Robbery, and [*ἄρπαγμα*] the *Prey*, or *Purchase* of Robbery: and this according to the Genius and common Use of the *Greek* Language, which ordinarily makes this distinction between the Verbals formed and terminated in this manner, when both are in use; which will easily appear in a great number and variety of Examples III. Nor do I see but the Authority of *Athanasius*, *Basil*, &c. who were such Masters of the *Greek* Language, and expound the Phrase to the same Sense with our Translation, deserves as much regard as that of *Heliodorus*, (if he had turned it to another Sense, as in truth he does not) tho they wrote since the *Nicene* Council. Nor does the vulgar *Latin* disagree with this \*, or *Tertulian* †, against whom there is not that Exception, known to be well conversant in the *Greek* Writers, and industriously to imitate them. || Indeed the other rendring is so harsh and unnatu-

III A few Instances, among a Multitude I have mark'd, may shew this to the Reader. [*κόρασις*] The Punishment which is inflicted; [*κολαμὸς*] Punishing, or the Act of inflicting Punishment. [*ἀγόρασις*] Merces, the Thing bought; [*ἀγορασμὸς*] the Act of Buying. [*ἄλυσμα*] Numen, the thing worshipped; [*σεβασμός*] the Act of Adoration. [*ἄθροισμα*] the Congregation, or Company gather'd; [*ἄθροισμός*] the congregating, or gathering of it. [*θησαύρισμα*] what is laid up as a Treasure. [*θησαυρισμός*] the laying up in Treasure. [*ἐξίλασμα*] that which is to propitiate; [*ἐξίλασμος*] the Act of propitiating. [*διδάγμα, διδάγμος. ἀσπασμα. ἀσπασμός. λόγισμα. λογισμός*] &c.

\* Qui cum in forma Dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est, esse se æqualem Deo.

† Et Sermo enim Deus, qui in effigie Dei constitutus, non rapinam æstimavit parari Deo. In lib. de Resur. Carnis, cap. 6.

|| If [*ἄρπαγμος*] should yet be thought to signify Rapine, both in the active and passive Sense, as Rapina in the Latin; our Translation must be allow'd to be just and warrantable, nor to be confuted from the Context, where nothing appears to oblige to a different Construction.

ral,



ral, that 'tis with difficulty and apparent violence that the Expression is drawn to say, *he did not arrogate, or assume by violence, he did not covet earnestly, or snatch at, &c.* 'There is a difference, says Dr. Hammond, between *assuming* and *thinking*, and consequently [*ἡσέδα*] *to think*, being joined with [*ῥεπαγ-μὸς*] *Rapine*, must signify to think or count it a *Rapine*, or an *Injury*, (which is very distant from *boasting* of it as a *Prize, triumphing* or *assuming*) and that is the Notion, that the ordinary Interpretation gives of it; thus he therefore paraphrases the words, Who being truly God, thought it no Encroachment to be in Equality with his Father. And notes, that little would be gained to the Cause of the *Photinians* and *Arians*, tho the Sense of this Phrase should be mistaken.' Hence it comes to pass that Writers on our side, secure of their Point even from this Text, (and thinking but little Injury to be done to the Cause in the main, tho declining a nicer Debate about the Phrase, they should even admit the other Sense) do insist upon such an Interpretation, as gives no advantage to them, who oppose the Deity of Christ, and his Equality with the Father. This I shew'd by a Quotation from the excellent Dr. Tillotson; upon which our Author says, *Mr. Moore seems to aim at an Argument from his being here said to be in the Form of God: but as he has not very clearly put it together, I shall content myself with referring the Reader to Dr. Whitby.* The truth is, I was content to urge and leave the Argument as I found it, in the Archbishop's own words, without altering the Expression or Method\*; assur'd that the impartial Reader would not think him incapable of *putting the Argument well enough together*, whatever be our Author's opinion about it.

---

\* Works fol. p. 541.

I confess I was never satisfy'd with *Grotius's* Account, of our Lord's *being in the Form of God*, as signifying his Power of working Miracles; nor altogether with *Dr. Whitby's*, who understands by it that glorious Form, in which God on his Throne is represented, that Majesty in which he is said to appear in Scripture, and in which the *Logos*, or the Word, did shew himself of old to *Moses* and the Patriarchs: tho I think this to be peculiar and appropriate to the Most High, and that no created Angel ever assumed or appeared in this Glory; and can admit what the Doctor adds, 'It appears that this Nature, in which Christ appeared before his Conception in the Virgin's Womb, must be Divine; for what other Nature could appear in the Form of God, and challenge to itself the Glory, which by the *Jews* was still esteemed a certain Indication of the Divine Presence, and in the New Testament is stiled the *Glory of the Father*. Especially if we consider, that He who thus appeared hath the incommunicable Name *Jehovah* so oft ascribed to him, is stiled *the Judge of the whole Earth*, and either challengeth to himself the Divine Attributes and Offices, or never doth refuse them, when they are offer'd to him by Men.'

HIS *being in the Form of God*, stands manifestly opposed to his *taking upon him the Form of a Servant*, and his *being made in the Likeness of Men* \*. If then these latter Expressions denote his being truly a Man, and a Servant, as there appears no reason at all to doubt; how can the former be esteemed to signify

---

\* So Tertullian argued contr. Marcion, lib. 5. cap. 20. *Æque non erit Deus Christus verè, si nec Homo verè fuit in effigie hominis constitutus*——Quod si in effigie & imagine, qua filius Patris verè Dei prædicatus est, etiam in effigie & imagine hominis, qua filius hominis, verè hominem inventum.

less, than his being truly and really God? Had he been but a Creature, he would be ever, by necessity of Nature, a Servant of God, however dignify'd by him, or to whatsoever State of Exaltation and Glory advanced. But 'tis from the Dignity of Christ's Person that the Apostle takes his Rise, to set forth his matchless and amazing Condescension, in his Incarnation, Obedience, and Sufferings, and to commend his Humility, as a Pattern for our Imitation. Yet it seems but an odd sort of Argument, to persuade us to be humble by Christ's Example, and to be of the same mind with him, who being but a Creature, or absolutely inferior to God, was pleas'd not to affect, or arrogate to himself, an Equality with God.

OUR Author *having done with what I had to say in defence of the Arguments, which, it seems, my Friends use to alledge for the Deity of Christ;* is in some hope, that his Reader will be so *candid* and complaisant, as to take his word for it, that *his Answers were substantial,* and that *I had little to reply to them.* I can say, I have endeavour'd fairly to examine his Answers and Exceptions, without attempting to put harsh and foreign Interpretations upon Holy Scripture, or any other than what I take to be the true and intended Meaning. Nor am I ashamed to have the Generality of the Pious and Learned for *my Friends* in a Cause, whose Strength lies not in Management and Artifice, but plain Argument, and clear Scripture-Declarations.

WHETHER what he proceeds to *alledge*, in proof of his own Scheme, be more *substantial* than his *Answers*, we are now to consider.

HIS first and principal Argument, is, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5, 6. *We know that an Idol is nothing in the World, and that there is none other God but one; for though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven or in*  
P Earth,



*Earth, (as there be Gods many, and Lords many) yet to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we for him ; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* Now since so great stress lies upon this Text, and that if this fails, there's scarce any other alledg'd so specious and plausible in favour of his Opinion ; I am willing carefully to enquire how he makes out his Proof from it. Nor do I find upon a Review, that I passed any thing which I thought to be of moment in the Letter upon this Head. He there says, that *the Apostle is here purposely asserting the Unity of the Godhead, in opposition to such Beings as might in a looser Sense have that Appellation given to them.* Therefore here, if any where, he would most plainly tell us who this one God is. Well, let this be granted : if what this Gentleman asserts be true, that *the Father alone is the one God*, and the plain Assertion here is, that there is none other God but one, what must be infer'd, but that in what Rank of Being soever Christ is placed, he cannot be called or owned to be God in a proper, but only in a looser Sense ? And what is then become of the Pretence of Christ's true and proper Divinity, that he is God by Nature, &c. which serves to amuse a little while ? Is it come to this, that tho the Appellation may be given him on some account or other, in a looser way of speaking ; yet in truth and reality he is not God at all, nor can be properly so called ? Yet nothing is plainer in Scripture, than that He is both absolutely called God, and hath the Attributes, Works, and Worship of God given to him.

WHEN with Transport he asked, *Can any Mortal give a reason, why if the Apostle had been of the mind of your severe Censurers, he should not have express'd himself thus, But to us there is but one God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ?* I answer'd plainly, that it was not the Apostle's Design here, nor did the Subject he was upon oblige him to give an account of the Mystery  
of

of the Trinity, nor was he under any necessity of representing the Differences or distinct Relations conceivable in the Divine Nature. He replies, *The Apostle was not designing to give an account of any Mystery at all, but was speaking of the Unity of God.* Very well! no wonder then, tho he were of our mind, that he speaks only of the Unity, and not of a Mystery he had no occasion or design there to give account of. Yet I suppose he will not deny that there is any thing of Mystery, or what is beyond our present Knowledge, in the Divine Nature. *Certainly, says he, nothing is inconceivable, if this be not, that the same Nature and Essence shall differ from, or be related to itself.* But who says this? Where does he find this to be our Sense? What tho the same Essence differs not from itself, is it therefore impossible to conceive that there may be some Differences in the same Nature? The Nature or Essence of the rational Soul is one and the same, and differs not from itself; yet it is not inconceivable that Understanding and Will should differ from, and relate to each other, in the same Soul. And he cannot prove that there are not as true, and more considerable Differences in the Divine Nature, or that they are inconceivable.

He adds, *But there is no other way these Men have of defending themselves, but by always taking their main Hypothesis for granted. See their Course: they assert that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, constitute the One God. We demand where this is asserted in Scripture.* As if we proved not by the plainest and most express Texts of Scripture, that to us there is but One God, that the Father is God, that the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost also, possess'd of the appropriate Titles, Perfections, and Glory of the Divine Nature. But how comes this Proof to be demanded here? 'Tis enough for me in this place, to do the part of a Respondent, and to expect that our Author, as he hath undertaken, prove his Point from the Text under

debate. *Ay!* says he, *we produce plain and exprefs Assertions, that the Father ALONE is the One God.* But pray where are those plain and exprefs Assertions? Not one, that I find, can be produced, which asserts the Father *alone* is God, in opposition to, and exclusion of the Son and the Holy Ghost. That this Text asserts, that there is but One God, we plainly acknowledge, and that the Father is God; but that the Son is not God, it neither says, nor can it be truly infer'd from it. 'Tis certain, that the Scriptures say he is, and in the strongest Terms; and this very Text speaks of him as Lord, in such a manner, as is appropriate to the One God: and we may believe him when he says, *I and my Father are One.*

I took notice, that the thing which the Apostle purposely asserts, as best answering the End he had in view, is, that to us there is but One God, in opposition to the Polytheism of the *Gentiles*, or the Opinion and Worship of many Gods. And his *specifying who this One God is*, (as our Author would have it) alters not the Case; for that the Father is the one God, nobody doubts, and that emphatically so called, and of prime Consideration in respect of Order, which is no prejudice at all to the Deity of the Son. He adds, *Had the Apostle been of the common Opinion, he would never have confuted the Polytheism of the Gentiles, without obviating the Objection, which Christianity might seem liable to.* But he himself is pleased to tell us, p. 75. that *the Apostle is not (here) proving the Christian Principles, but arguing upon them.* Indeed, he is not here writing an Apology against the *Gentiles*, or answering the Objections that Christianity might be liable to; but endeavouring to satisfy the Scruples of Christians about eating things sacrificed to Idols. He therefore observes, that an Idol is nothing in the World, has nothing of Divinity in it, so that they had no ground for Apprehension or Fear, no Religious Respect or Veneration being due to it.

Where-



Wherefore he adds, *ver. 7. Howbeit, there is not in every Man that Knowledge; for some with Conscience of the Idol unto this hour, eat it as a thing offered unto an Idol, and their Conscience being weak, is defiled.* \* Well-informed Christians knew, there was but one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ to be worshipped; the Weak thought there might be some *Deastri* or *Inferior Lords*, to whom some Reverence was due.

BUT, *Is here not manifestly a Snare? He calls them off from many Gods, by assuring them that there is but one God; and this one God, he says, is the Father. And could any one read what he says, without apprehending his Design was, that Christians should believe, that the Father alone is this one God, (but the Apostle does not here say it) and especially when he so carefully distinguishes this one God from Jesus Christ? I answer; We apprehend no more Snare in this, than in addressing our Worship to the Father (for the reason just specify'd) through Jesus Christ, even while we are so far from intending to worship the Father as the alone God, separately and exclusively of the Son and Spirit, that we designedly include, or professedly suppose both Son and Holy Ghost included, in the undivided Object of our Worship, and yet consider Christ Jesus distinctly, or distinguish'd as Mediator. Thus when we speak absolutely of God, or of the Almighty, the Eternal God, tho the Father be more distinctly and in the first place intended, yet without any design of excluding the other Persons, but only all other separate Beings not necessarily in God the Father, that in their own Nature are excluded from Deity, and have no Right to be worshipped; and this is commonly done and understood so as to supersede the Necessity of further Caution.*

---

\* Whitby's Note on 1 Cor. viii. 7.

I suggested, that had the Apostle been of the mind of the Author, must he not have said, Whereas there are many that are called *Gods* and *Lords*, many had in veneration among the deluded Heathen, to us Christians there are but two Gods, one supreme and unoriginated, the other subordinate and inferior, a God also by Office and delegated Power? His Answer is, *Tho the Apostle really expresses this Sense, yet he does it in a much better manner.* Then it seems it was his meaning, that to us Christians there are two Gods, tho he did not think fit to speak out. But I see not how he could more expressly and peremptorily declare the contrary; or how well this was like to obviate the Objection that Christianity would be liable to, with a witness. And pray how does our Author prove that this was the Apostle's Sense, the thing he undertook to do, and which of any thing he ought to do, so apparently contrary to plainest Scripture, to the first and great Commandment, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*; so contrary to the Design of the Gospel, to establish the Belief and Worship of the one only true God, in opposition to all who by Nature are no Gods? Instead of this, he is so good-natur'd, as for my sake to transcribe at large out of the Learned Mr. Joseph Mede, what he had said upon this Text; which, I can assure him, I perused and consider'd many Years since, but saw little occasion to take notice of in my Defence, tho he be so charm'd with it, as fancying it to cast a more favourable Aspect upon his beloved Opinion. However, it seems not to me, upon a fair and reasonable Construction, such as himself, 'tis likely, intended, or would admit as in the common Faith, to be inconsistent herewith. And tho he fancies the Apostle to allude to *superior and inferior Deities in the Heathen Theology, and the Allusion to be passing elegant*; yet it appears not that even the Heathen did assert, that there were many sovereign or supreme independent Gods, or that

th  
Ap  
ny  
ma  
ma  
kin  
Lo  
Ho  
for  
tha

no  
Fat  
is  
Lo  
Wh  
fam  
ver  
vate  
Wr  
whi  
suffi  
wha  
swe  
the  
speak  
Lora  
the  
thin  
Apoc  
Fath  
amor  
one  
Char  
that

\* 1  
Dr. W

( III )

that the *Dii Cœlestes* were all such. Nor does the Apostle say there are Gods many, and Demons many; or sovereign Deities many, and inferior Deities many; but indifferently Gods many, and Lords many, possibly without design to specify different kinds of Deities, but such, whether called Gods or Lords, as they made the Object of their Worship. However this be, neither our Author, nor Mr. Mede for him, make out any clear or certain Proof of this, that to us Christians there are two Gods.

THE Apostle's saying, *To us there is but one God*, no more excludes Christ from being God with his Father, the God of Christians, than by adding, *There is but one Lord*, excludes the Father from being the Lord of Christians. And I took notice that Dr. Whitby quotes Origen and Novatian arguing in the same manner from this Text \*. I need not here divert with the Author to the Consideration of the private Sentiments, and particular Explications of those Writers in relation to the Doctrine of the Trinity, which is not the Subject of our present Debate. It suffices that they argued after this manner, which is what the Doctor cited them for. He gives for Answer, that his saying there is but one Lord, *excludes the Father from being Lord in that Sense, in which he speaks of Christ as such; for he evidently speaks of him as Lord in a subordinate Sense: so his speaking of one God the Father, excludes Christ from being the one God*. Methinks, he should have at least added, to compleat the *Apodosis*, in that Sense, In which he speaks of the Father as such; and the Remark then would have amounted to more than this, That Christ is not the one God in the Person of the Father, or under that Character and Consideration; nor do we suppose, that Christ is the Father. And how does it appear,

---

\* But may refer to Dr. Bull's Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 2. Cap. 9, 10. Dr. Waterl. Def. of Quer. p. 13, 14, &c.

that



that the Father's being the one God does exclude Christ from Deity, any more than Christ's being the one Lord, excludes the Father from Lordship? If Christ's being the one Lord, must not here be taken in the strict exclusive Sense, what necessity for us to understand the Father's being the one God in that Sense, except we take the thing in question for granted, without being proved?

DEUT. vi. 4. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.* Joh. xx. 28. *Thomas said to Christ, My Lord and my God.* Isa. xliii. 11. *I am the Lord, and beside me there is no Saviour.* The Father is one Lord, and the only Saviour, yet Christ is not excluded. No, says our Author, *besides the Father there is no co-ordinate Saviour, but subordinate Saviours there may be; as* Neh. ix. 7. *and* Tit. iii. 4, 5, 6. *God our Saviour saves us thro Jesus Christ our Saviour.* If he be in earnest, and seeks not by this to perplex the Minds of the Unwary, I need only observe, that a Man takes him for his Lord and Saviour in the strict and most proper Sense, unto whom he absolutely resigns and devotes himself, and whom he trusts with his everlasting Concerns, as able to save unto the uttermost. Compare *Isa. xlv. 21, 22, 23.* apply'd to Christ, *Rom. xiv. 9, 10, 11.* *There is no God else beside me, a Saviour, there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the Ends of the Earth, for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, that unto me every Knee shall bow, and every Tongue shall swear.* The Father and Son are not co-ordinate Lords, and co-ordinate Saviours, as of separate Natures, and divided Powers; but being of one Nature and Perfection, they are one in the Work of Salvation, tho acting under a distinct Character, and in distinct Offices. Nor is there any difficulty in saying, that God or the Father doth save us thro Christ the Mediator, or that as Mediator he is subordinate to the Father. Nor did I forget myself, in the Answer I gave to what he urged, *that the Fa-*  
ther

ther is called the one God in contradistinction to Jesus Christ: saying that the Apostle speaks of Christ under another Character, as in our Nature ordain'd a Mediator. He adds, *What then is become of all his arguing before? If this be the meaning of his being the one Lord, can the Father be suppos'd to be Lord in any such Sense? &c.* As if the Father's Lordship were a separate and divided thing from the Lordship of the Son, or the Son did lose or relinquish his Rights as God, by becoming, or taking upon him the Office of a Mediator in our Nature, and therein exercising a subordinate Power. The truth is, the Apostle here speaks of him as the one Lord of Christians, both as the proper Object of their Religious Worship with the Father, and also as by whom all things subsist and are now administer'd. Not only by him are all things, which come from the Father to us, and thro whom alone we find Access to him, which can be but part of the Meaning; but he is such a *one Lord, as by whom all things were created and made*, Eph. iii. 9. John i. 3. *All things that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth.* Col. i. 16. *And without him was not any thing made that was made.* Is it the distinguishing Character of the Most High, that *all things were made by him, and for him?* Heb. ii. 10. Rom. xi. 36. 'Tis asserted of this one Lord, *All things were created by him, and for him*, Col. i. 16. And he does *uphold all things by the Word of his Power*, Heb. i. 3. The Father and Son appear undivided in Power and Operation, for *what things soever the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise*, Joh. v. 19. Nor is it any Diminution of the Honour of his Lordship, that by Dispensation, and by the Father's Will, the sole Administration of things in the Kingdom of Grace is left in his hands.

As for his referring me to *Par. 2. p. 42, 43.* for Answer to what was quoted from Dr. *Whitby*, I find nothing there deserving notice, but what has been already consider'd; as hath also been what he next



urges as a Proof, that Christ cannot be the one God, 1 Tim. ii. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus*; saying, *The Question is, whether the one God is not contradistinguish'd to the Mediator?* And what Absurdity in this, since the Apostle speaks of the *MAN* Christ Jesus? He again asks, *Is the Mediator a Mediator to himself?* And why may not the *Man* Christ be a Mediator with God? Or why should he be thought less capable of adjusting the Difference between God and Men, for having the Fullness of the Deity dwelling in him, or being inseparably united to the Word, being as a Day's-Man, that takes hold of both? But these things have been spoken to before.

UPON my using that Expression of the Fullness of the Deity dwelling in Christ, our Author is forward to give his Sense of the Text (it seems) *I hinted at*, Col. ii. 9. Well, let it then come out. *I do not think then that by* bodily, *the Apostle means*, in his human Nature. And what then? I did not so much as mention the word *bodily*, much less make any Argument from it. Suppose then *bodily* should here signify really or substantially: if the Godhead be really and substantially in him, it is enough; and what hinders, but if this Fullness dwell in the *Man* Christ, it may dwell in human Nature? especially if his great Discovery be right, that the Fullness of the Godhead imports but *the Blessings that God doth communicate and fill with*. And when he can prove from Scripture, that the *Godhead* is put for *Gifts and Blessings*, and that [*θεότης*] may not signify Deity or the divine Nature, as well as [*ανθρωπότης*] Humanity or human Nature, his Interpretation may be further consider'd. In the mean time, Dr. *Whitby's* Account of this Text may possibly be as edifying to the Reader, if he please to consult it, as that of others, who find the Expression in *Eph. iii. 19.* to differ from this,  
and



and to be construed to a very different Meaning: But enough of this.

As for his next Argument, *Eph. iv. 6.* We deny not that the Father is one God over or above all, yet however find that this Title, [*ὁ ὁὖν πρῶτος θεὸς ἐς*] *God over or above all*, is not so peculiar to the Father, but that the same is given also to the Son, *Rom. ix. 5.* We deny not, that there is one, who is both one God, and the Father. *All the three Persons*, says he, *are distinctly mention'd, but the Godhead is peculiarly attributed to the Father; and he, as distinguish'd from the other Persons, is said to be the one God.* If by the *Godhead's being peculiarly attributed to the Father*, he mean that the Father is called the one God peculiarly, or by way of Emphasis, as first in order, this may be allow'd even in distinction from, but not in opposition to, or exclusion of the other Persons; even as there is *one Lord*, and *one Spirit* distinguish'd from the Father, but not so as to exclude him from *Lordship*, or from being *Spirit*. They are indeed distinguish'd, so as not to be God the Father; but that they are distinguish'd upon the account, or in respect of Godhead, so as to be only exalted Creatures, or Beings separate, and of a different nature from the Father, appears not at all from the Text, and still remains to be proved. His confident saying, *Certainly the Text is very full to the purpose, &c.* may possibly pass with such as are willing to take it for granted, but will signify little with them that look for certain Proof. Nor can I find this any farther made out, or the Answer which I gave disprov'd by the Questions he offers by way of Reply; *Is this answering of Arguments? Is this a dealing fairly and candidly with the Scriptures?* If I had wronged them, he might have shewn fairly and candidly wherein. *Does not this Answer go entirely upon the Supposition, that the three Persons are the one God? And must we run round in a Circle without end?* If I had done this, I should but have follow'd his Exam-

ple; and I am forced to repeat Answers to his often repeating the same thing, but I innocently thought he had undertaken, by clear Argument from this Text, to overthrow my Supposition, and evince the Truth of his own. Instead of this, he adds, *Let Mr. Moore now prove that I mistake the Apostle's Assertion.* As if I was concern'd in the Sense, he thought for his turn to put upon the Apostle's Assertion, any farther than to shew, that it contain'd not a certain and sufficient Argument against the Deity of Christ, which we give clear and abundant Proof of from other Scriptures: and this indeed is to prove that he mistakes the Sense.

WHAT has been offered and observed, may easily be apply'd to *John xvii. 3. This is Life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* Whence he argued, *If the Father, to whom Christ there speaks, as distinguish'd from Christ whom he sent, be the only true God, how can Christ be the only true God also?* I said, because Christ and the Father are one. He then asks, *What does he mean by their being one?* I answer, One in Nature and Perfection, as well as Design. One in respect of Deity, not one Person. Well then, he goes on, *was the Person of the Father the only true God, as distinguish'd from Jesus Christ?* I answer, The Person of the Father is indeed there distinguish'd from the Person of the Son, and he is said to be *the only true God*; and there is no doubt but he is, and may be justly so stiled, which is all that appears, and can be proved from the Text. But it is not there said, that the Father *only* is the true God; nor does it appear, that he is there called the only true God, on the score, or upon the account of his being distinguish'd from Christ, in opposition to the Son, and in a Sense exclusive of him.

I said, Nor can these words be reasonably supposed to exclude him from a true Divinity, who is  
in



in Scripture stiled [ ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς ] *The true God*, 1 Joh. v. 20. referring to Dr. *Whitby* on the place, who assigns substantial Reasons for understanding it of Jesus Christ. His Reply is, *This is answer'd*, Part 2. p. 33. where instead of an Answer, I find only an obscure Passage \*, which he calls Mr. *Baxter's* Explication of the Text, who is well known to be for Christ's being *true God*. But neither he, nor Mr. *Baxter* for him, in the Passage quoted, make answer to the Doctor's Reasons. And it is one thing to put this, or the other Sense upon a Text, and another to shew by convincing Reasons, that it ought to be understood in that Sense.

I added, True therefore is the Gloss of *Grotius*, that he is stiled the only true God, in exclusion of those whom the false Persuasion of the *Gentiles* had introduced, not so as to exclude the other Persons. But, says he, *I see no reason for this. The word alone, seems to me to exclude all Persons whatever from being the true God, co-ordinate with the Father.* Which may be admitted in reference to such Persons as are of a separate Substance, divided from the Father; but cannot be true of such as are in necessary conjunction with him, and together Partakers of the same undivided Essence. However, I shew'd that the word *only*, or *alone*, is frequently apply'd to God in the Old Testament, in opposition to Idols or false Gods. Deut. xxxii. 12. [ κύριος μόνος ] *The Lord alone did lead them*, or the Lord *only* was their Guide, and there was no strange God with them [ θεὸς ἀλλότριος ] Isa. xliii. 11, 12. *I am the Lord; and beside me there is no Saviour; there was no strange God among you*, [ ἐκ ἡν ἀλότριος. ] And yet the Angel, in whom his Name was, went with them, and saved them, Exod. xxiii. 20, 21. Isa. lxiii. 9. Now Christ Jesus cannot be excluded as *strange* and aliene

---

\* *Baxter's Saint's Rest, Part 1. Chap. 4. Sect. 6.*



to the Father, who is so nearly and necessarily related to him as his *own Son*, who is One with him; so as whosoever hath seen him, hath seen the Father also, not only in the Bosom of the Father, but so intimately united, as that he is in the Father, and the Father in him; and whosoever honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father.

NOR does his mentioning here, *Co-ordinate Persons with the Father*, as excluded, answer the Design of those Texts, the plain meaning of which is, to exclude all strange Gods, whether sovereign or subordinate, superior or inferior, as having no Right to Divine Honour or Religious Worship, being excluded from true Deity, and by Nature no Gods; which is not the Case of our Blessed Saviour. Nor can a sufficient Argument be drawn from this Text, for the excluding of Christ from true Deity, while another sufficient Reason may be given, for calling the Father here the only true God, without that Supposition.

INDEED [*μόνος*] in particular, and other like Terms of Exclusion in general, must often be understood, not absolutely and in the utmost Rigour, but with certain Exceptions, which good Sense, and the Circumstances of the Place, direct and determine to. *John viii. 9. Jesus was left alone, and the Woman in the midst*, [*καλελείφθη μόνος*]; her Accusers being gone. *Luke ix. 36. Jesus was found alone*, [*εὕρεθι μόνος*] *Moses and Elias* being departed, tho his three Disciples were still with him. *Isa. xlv. 24. Jehovah stretched forth the Heavens alone*; yet the Word was then with him, and so far concern'd in the Operation, as nothing was done without him, *Prov. viii. 27. Joh. i. 2, 3. Thus 1 Cor. ii. 2. I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucify'd*. Surely he designed not to exclude all other Knowledge. No wonder then that I saw not sufficient reason, why *Rom. xvi. 27. To God only wise, and Rev.*

xv. 4. *Thou only art holy* ; Christ should be thought to be excluded.

To the former, he says, *So that the Apostle is to be understood, as ascribing Glory to Christ thro Christ.* As if God could not be *only wise*, except his *Word* and *Wisdom* be excluded, because Glory is given to him thro the Mediation of the Man Christ Jesus. Nor is it so undoubtedly certain, that Christ is not intended, *Jude ver. 25. To the only wise God, our Saviour.*

As to the latter, tho it should be spoken directly of the Father, there appears no necessity of excluding the Son, who has the Character of *holy* so often given him. I am therefore little concerned, *tho Bishop Pearson acknowledges the Title* [*παντοκράτωρ*] *Almighty, to belong to the Father, and never to be attributed to the Son.* However, I observ'd, that Christ seems both here, and *Rev. i. 8.* (as *Dr. Hammond* also judges) to be stiled *the Almighty.* 'Tis he that is spoken of in the Context ; and the other part of the Description there made of him, is unquestionably claimed by him, *ver. 11, 17.* and *chap. xxii. 13.* mention'd as the proper Character of the Lord of Hosts, *Isa. xlv. 6.* Here for Answer he sends me to *Part 1. p. 14.* where he thinks it enough to say, *'Tis the Father that calls himself the Almighty, ver. 8. the Lord which is, and which was, and which is to come ; and this is the only Title which is given to the Father, ver. 4. in contradistinction to Jesus Christ, ver. 5.* But it follows not, that, because the Father and Christ are spoken of distinctly, the Father must have a Title and Character given him in contradistinction to the Son, or such an one as does not belong to the Son ; especially when the Son, as here, *ver. 5.* is distinguish'd by his peculiar Characters, as the First-begotten from the Dead, &c.

AND since Christ is undoubtedly spoken of in the following Verses, and particularly *ver. 7.* and the after Description manifestly belongs to him ; there appears no other reason or necessity, why we should  
not



not understand *ver. 8.* as spoken of him, but that our Author's Opinion cannot so conveniently allow him the Character he there claims \*. He seems willing also, for the same reason, to explain away from him what he challenges to himself, in the words of the Lord of Hosts, as a Mark of his being the only true God, *Isa. xlv. 6.* therefore says, *Since Christ is spoken of as Mediator, where he is called the first and the last, I think we may justly conclude, that no more is meant, than that he is the only Mediator.* One would think a Man pretty hard put to it, that is forced upon such a Shift. What Occasion or Necessity appears here for Christ to say, or for us to understand him as saying, *I am the first and last Mediator?* Or do we find him to say this any where else, upon any occasion? Somewhat strange! that he should usurp the Title which so apparently belongs to the Great God, and is so expressly assum'd by him, and this without necessary guard, or mark of Difference. Nor is every thing that is predicated of the Mediator, presently to be understood to belong to him merely as such, or only under that Consideration; but rather this (as many other things) is spoken directly of his Person, as fitly qualify'd for such an Office. And how can it be *justly concluded*, that *no more* is intended? What can necessitate such a Restriction? when the words in themselves, and in the place whence they are taken, are apparently of a more extensive Import. Besides, he does not only say, *I am the first and the last*; but as *ver. 11.* compar'd with *Chap. xxii. 13.* *I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending*, [*ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος*] the proper Characters of the Almighty, and challeng'd by him, *ver. 8.* manifestly signifying more than *I am the*

---

\* The Learned Dr. Waterland says, All the Antients, both before and after the Council of *Nice*, understand this of God the Son. *Serm. p. 227.*



*first and last Mediator, (if this be at all meant) since All things were created by him, and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist, Col. i. 16, 17. This is he, that is the Subject of the Predication, if that must be taken to determine the Sense. He added, as another Reason why the Father alone is spoken of in this Rev. xv. 4. (and if he be, our Cause is no way prejudiced) that the Song itself is called, The Song of Moses and the Lamb; which must import, that Moses and the Lamb sing it, and thus praise him, who alone is holy. And why must it import this? What unavoidable Necessity? Why may it not import, as Dr. Hammond expresses it, They sung to Christ the same Song (or another after that Pattern) that Moses had done upon the Victory and Deliverance out of Egypt? The rather, for that we find, as I observ'd, that in the other Songs of this Book, instead of the Lamb's singing, both Angels and Saints make him the Subject of their Songs, and address their Songs to him, and that jointly with the Father. But does Mr. Moore find that the Songs of that nature are called the Songs of Moses and the Lamb? I answer; I find not the Expression any where else, whence I might more certainly conclude what this must here import, nor it may be was there a like occasion to use it; but to me it seems much more reasonable to understand it in the Sense I have given, nor do I find he can disprove it. If yet we should take it in the Sense he is willing to impose upon it, what would it amount to more, than that the Man Christ Jesus offer'd Prayer with Thanksgiving to the Father, which we deny not? As in Job. xvii. which has been under consideration; where, as I suggested, if the word Father should be taken, not in the strict relative Sense, but as comprizing the Godhead, as it seems elsewhere sometime to do, and if we consider Christ as the Messiah, the Man Christ, making this Prayer, the Sense will be clear. This our Author would*

have to pass for a Shift, because I produced not any place of this nature. I did indeed but suggest it, there being no occasion to insist upon it, the Text having been otherwise cleared, and the true Sense of it accounted for, which yet is not inconsistent with this; nor do I see any Absurdity in taking *Father* to signify this, as here: 1o 1 *Per.* i. 17. 1 *Cor.* xv 24. and some other places.

WE have thus seen the Strength of our Author's Arguments and Exceptions against the Deity of Christ, in the strict and proper Sense, especially from two or three Texts. The Considerate and Impartial may judge of what moment they are, set in the Balance, and compared with those numerous, and to appearance very plain Declarations of Holy Scripture for it; ascribing the most Divine Characters to him, and demanding for him our warmest Affections, and highest Service.

BUT tho Christ differ not from the Father in respect of Deity, yet the Father is greater than he, as Man and Mediator, and also consider'd relatively, as second among the Divine Persons. Our Author asks, *What does he mean by He, the Subject of the Relation? Is he a Being, or no Being? If he be a Being, must it not be a distinct Being from that to which it is related?* I answer; The Son is a distinct Person from the Father, and stands related to him as such, without being of a different Nature or Deity. And as this Scripture-Discovery is sufficiently plain, there seems not to be any necessity for nicer Explications in order to our Duty and Salvation, or reason to perplex ourselves about Difficulties that do not affect it, and which are above the reach of our Understanding. In what Sense a distinct Person may be accounted a distinct Being or not, was before particularly stated and consider'd; so that what he talks about Contradictions, may serve for Flourish and Amusement, but little affects the Case. Can, says he, *the same Being*  
be



*be a Father to itself, or a Son to itself?* As if we were at all concerned in such Reasoning and Consequences, who say not that the Godhead is the Father, but in the same undivided Godhead, consider the distinct Persons of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; reserving to the Father a Priority of Order, as first of the Three.

I observ'd, a Father is always consider'd in that relation as above his Son, and yet his Son not inferior to him, in the Nature, Properties, and Endowments of a Man; much less is a Son of one kind and nature, and a Father of another. *This, he thinks, may be turned the other way, because if God begets a Son, whose Essence is distinct (as among Men) and whose Nature, Properties, and Endowments are exactly alike and equal to his own, there will of necessity be two supreme Gods; which is impossible.* Since therefore this is impossible, and to us there is but one God, we suppose if God has a Son, a natural and proper Son, who must be God as well as his Father, that his Essence is not distinct as among Men, that he subsists (tho under some distinct Consideration) in the same undivided Essence, or partakes of the same Divine Nature. But our Author's Inference is, *that it being impossible that God should have thus a Son in nature equal to himself, this must be understood in a different Sense, and that the Relation is not to be strained to a Resemblance of that common among us, in every Point.* But tho it should not be strained to a Resemblance in every Point, methinks what belongs most properly to the Nature of a true and proper Son, or what is essential to the natural Relation, shou'd not be deny'd him, so as he shou'd be quite of a different Kind and Nature from his own Father: *But is it not said of Adam, of good Men, of Angels, that they are Sons of God?* 'Tis true, they are so, as his Creatures, and thus God is the Father of Spirits, as he is the Creator, or Former of them, *Heb. xii. 9. Zech. xii. 1.* And if Christ be but a Creature,



ture, or a Son by Creation, as they, we might admit of his Inference. But the Scriptures set him in an higher Orb, and superior Rank of Being, (*To which of the Angels said God, at any time, Thou art my Son? Heb. i. 5.*) suppose him to be of quite another Kind and Nature, than Creatures, and ascribe to him freely, and without hesitation, the distinguishing Marks and Perfections of Deity. We consider him indeed as God's own Son, in the true and natural Sense, and not a Son by Adoption, or by way of Figure and Allusion, yet argue not barely from the Resemblance which the relation imports, but likewise the account which the Scripture gives of him; we take his Character from thence, and find it glorious, as of the only-begotten of the Father. Of such a Son of God we speak, as requires that we honour him even as we honour the Father, accounting it no Robbery to be equal with God.

OUR Author complains, that *tho I grant a Subordination of the Son to the Father*, (surely he cou'd not suppose me to grant that he is a subordinate God, while I allow an Order among the Divine Persons) *yet I make no use of it where he wou'd think I had most occasion for it*, 1 Cor. xv. 24, 27, 28. No wonder 'tis here said, when he shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, (who has left the Administration of it to the Mediator unto that day) he shall himself also be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all; even to the Man Christ Jesus, and to all both Angels and Saints, brought to Perfection of Glory and Happiness in and by him.

HE seems here and elsewhere to mistake me, in supposing, that wherever Christ is call'd the Son of God, I do understand that he is spoken of as God; whereas I often take the *Man* Christ, the Messiah and Mediator, to be mentioned under that Character. *He seems*, says he, *to suppose, that the Mankind only*  
gives

*gives up the Kingdom.* The truth is, I do suppose, that it is the Mediatorial Kingdom that shall then determine, that the present Management by the Mediator shall then cease, and so that the Man Christ, the Mediator, shall deliver up the Kingdom to God.

He argues, *if Christ be Mediator in both Natures, and gives up the Kingdom as Mediator, must he not give it up in both Natures?* I answer; the Mediatorial Administration, however managed (whether in one or both Natures) shall then end, and be resigned. *And must not he that gives it up, become subject to the Father?* I answer; the Man Christ shall so become subject to the Father, as to have Mediatorial Judgment and Dominion no longer in his hand, there being no farther occasion for such a Dispensation.

*When the Apostle says, To God, even the Father, are we to understand him, that he shall give it up to the Father, to himself, and to the Holy Ghost?* I answer; the Mediator shall give it up, not to himself, for he shall be no longer Mediator, but to the Father, as first among the Divine Persons, who, not separately, but in conjunction with Word and Spirit, shall henceforth immediately, not by Mediatorial Administration, be all in all. But *if the Union of the two Natures continues, if the Divine Nature retains the Dominion, while it continues united to the Human, how does he give it up at all?* I answer; I find not that the Apostle speaks here of any other Kingdom, or Dominion, to be given up, but properly mediatorial; nor does the Divine Nature retain, or the Man Christ in Union with it any longer exercise, Mediatorial Dominion.

I took notice farther of two things, which considerate Christians cannot but have at heart, the astonishing Love of God in Jesus Christ, and the Value of his Sacrifice; the Glory of which they might justly apprehend to be in danger of being greatly eclips'd, by the Notions now advanced. No wonder if they be alarm'd, and upon their guard, when they apprehend

hend an Attempt made to darken the Glory of the only-begotten Son of God, and sap the Foundation of their Hope and Joy: if they inwardly disgust, and be ready to oppose the spreading of an Opinion, that appears to lessen Men's Esteem of the Person, and Grace, of the Blessed Jesus, and their Sense of Obligation to his matchless Love. They cannot but think the Life of Religion to be nearly concerned, and will not be much moved by Pretences of Charity, and the sober Life of some that are in it, or mere Moral Lectures, which they would have to pass for the only Practical Preaching. They cannot but fear, that true Piety will more sensibly dwindle and decay, when some of the main things that support and give Vigour to it in the Hearts and Lives of Men, are struck out of their Belief and Esteem, and represented as of little Use and Regard.

ONE thing that has been of principal use, to give Relief to distressed Consciences, and to settle the Tranquillity of guilty Minds, under just Apprehension of God's Displeasure for Sin, is that God sent forth his own Son in the Likeness of sinful Flesh, to be a Sacrifice for Sin; that this Sacrifice appointed by God, is of sufficient Value to expiate the Sins of the World from the Dignity of the Person suffering, and the Greatness of his sufferings in our Nature. We glory in the Merit of Christ's Obedience and Death, in that he was God manifested in Flesh. But the Letter boldly asserted, *The only Condescension they can speak of, is that of the Word's becoming related to a human Body and Soul, without the least Alteration or real Abasement of his Divine Nature.* As if it was no real Condescension and Abasement for him, that was in the Form of God, and truly God, to become Man, assume a Human Soul and Body into personal Union with himself; as if in such a case he had no real Concern in what the Human Nature suffer'd. This Condescension of Love however entertains the Wonder



Wonder and triumphant Songs of Angels, and the Hearts of Believers have been ever ravish'd with it.

\* But the Author would have it seem more *astonishing*, that a certain Being, *not indeed equal to God*, (he does not say, a mere Creature, tho' what else he can be, I am utterly unable to conceive) *should be divested of his Perfections for a time, put himself into the Condition of a poor mortal Man, wherein he was to learn and increase in Wisdom, have no power to do anything, be afflicted, suffer and die.* A strange and groundless Conceit! which I find not the Scripture to speak any thing of, and in other respects appears unaccountable; besides that the Love of God, in giving his only-begotten Son, is set forth in such Expressions, and in such a manner, as sound too big for the Condescension of a Creature, (or a Being infinitely distant from him, as that must of necessity be, that has not the Nature and Perfections of God) and to me, utterly transcend what this precarious Scheme can reasonably account for.

AND two things upon a just Estimate seem to abate Astonishment at the Love of such a Christ, as well as the Value of his Death, and the Pretence of meriting the Regards of the great God by laying down his Honours and his Life at his command. One, that he had nothing to part with but what he had freely received, and ought in duty and gratitude for the Honours that had been done him above others, readily to do, without making such a Merit of it. The other, that for a short Humiliation and Suffering in a human Body, he was to have so unexpressibly great Reward, and be advanced to Glory and universal Dominion, which he had no pretence of claim to; for a short Disgrace, and shorter Pain, by his order, who had a right to demand this and much more of him, to have all Power in Heaven and

---

\* *Lev. p. 15.*

Earth given him, seated in the Throne of the Most High, to be served and adored by Angels and Men.

I said, What tho' the Deity be impassible, and suffer'd not real Pain, or Alteration, when Christ bore our Sins in his Body on the Cross, his holy Soul felt the Sting and Bitterness of Death, was in greatest Agonies of Sorrow and Distress, and in the opinion of such as suppose its Pre-existence in a State of Glory, underwent such like Changes as our Author imagines in the Being he supposes to suffer in Flesh. Here he cries, *Where is the least word in the Sacred Books, of the pre-existent Soul of Christ, that was distinct from the Logos?* As if the Learned Dr. More, the late Bishop of Gloucester, and others, were not known to have alledged plausible Texts of Scripture, in favour of the Opinion. And tho' I declar'd not for it, yet it answer'd what I mention'd it for, nor is the Cause I plead concern'd in it. Origen's mind however is known in this, who observes in the Passage I quoted before \*, that the Word remaining in Substance the same, suffers none of those things, which the Body and Soul (he had assumed) suffer. *Whence is it then, that we read only of his bearing our Sins in his Body?* Yes, we read also, that his Soul was made an Offering for Sin, Isa. liii. 10. that his Soul was troubled, Joh. xii. 27. *My Soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto Death*, Mat. xxvi. 38. Mark xiv. 34, &c. *Why are the Jews charg'd with killing the Prince of Life?* Because they killed the Man Christ, or parted his Soul and Body; not that they could kill his Soul, or separate it from the Logos.

WHEREAS I farther observ'd, that which gave greatest Vertue and Price to his Obedience and Sufferings, was the infinite Dignity of his Person, not the mere Pain which his human Nature felt; he

---

\* P. 74. [ὁ ὁ λόγος τῇ ἑστίᾳ μέων λόγος, ἔδεν μὲν πάχει ὧν πάχει τὸ σῶμα ἢ ἡ ψυχὴ.] Orig. cont. Cels. lib. 4.

replies,

replies, *It was not the mere Pain felt, but truly felt by such a Person.* And who doubts, that the Pain Christ felt, he truly felt, or that the Person felt, what the human Nature felt, since his human Nature was not aliene to, or separate from his Person, but did really belong to it ?

As for his saying, that I *seemed apprehensive of the necessity of supposing, that the Nature itself that suffer'd, must be extraordinary, and the mere Relation of the impassible Logos, to an ordinary Soul and Body, would not have sufficed, whence I run into the Notion of the Pre-existence of our Saviour's Soul :* He is in a great mistake ; I neither asserted it, nor apprehended any necessity of doing it upon this account ; neither do I think that the Sufferings of Christ's human Nature (not *merely related to*, but really united with the Logos) did not suffice ; but rather suppose that if they had been the Sufferings of a different, however extraordinary Nature, they had not been so congruous and proper (if indeed available) means of expiating, and making atonement for, the Sins of Mankind. And tho I would not call Christ's Soul and Body an ordinary Soul and Body ; yet I must think them properly human, however distinguish'd by some special Privileges, and not of another Kind or Species, not of a Nature different from that of other Men.

WHEN I proceeded, How astonishing is the Consideration, that God was manifested in Flesh ; that tho' the Deity itself was not capable of Misery, yet the Lustre of its Glory was veil'd, and it was truly concern'd and interested in the Sufferings of the human Nature, which it was the most amazing Condescension for it to assume ! He is content to puzzle a plain matter with some Queries ; *How that Deity, which was not capable of Misery, was capable of being manifested in the Flesh ?* The invisible things of God, even his Eternal Power and Deity, are manifest, and may be clearly seen in the things that he has made,



Rom. i. 19, 20. What shou'd hinder, but that he may be more specially related to, or have a more special Residence in our Nature, if he pleases, and therein manifest, and give more sensible Proofs of Divinity? *If there be one Deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, how came the Deity of the Son, to be capable of being manifested in the Flesh, when the Deity of the Father, according to the Holy Scriptures, is not capable of such a Manifestation?* I am here at a loss for his Meaning, if by Manifestation is meant visible Appearance. I know not, that either Father, Word, or Holy Ghost, are capable of being immediately seen; Deity in itself is invisible, and so I suppose is the *Logos*, and even the Spirit that is within us: but if he speaks of Incarnation, why the Word, and not the Father, assum'd, and so in a sense appear'd in Human Nature, I need only say, it seems more congruous to the Order among the Divine Persons, that the second, and not the first, shou'd do this, who yet is God, as well as the Father, tho not God the Father. *What is meant by the Glory of Christ's Deity veil'd? To whom was it veil'd?* I answer; tho he ceased not to be God, when he took the Nature of Man, yet he appeared not with those visible Marks of Greatness and Majesty, he might have done as God, or with such a dazzling Lustre as now furrounds the Man Christ in Glory; but in a Condition of Infirmary and Suffering.

WE suppose not, as he wou'd *insinuate*, that God's own Son *did not suffer really and properly*, but *fancifully only*, except he was miserable in his highest Capacity. The Sufferings of Christ's Human Nature, were the real Sufferings of God's own Son, tho the Nature of God, (which he had together with the Nature of Man) was incapable of Suffering and Misery: nor do I doubt, but this amazing Condescension and Grace, will be the happy Subject of the Songs of Angels; and Triumphs of Saints to all Eternity, while Devils and harden'd Unbelievers fret and gnash

gnash their Teeth ; which our Author's Charity might have securely pass'd without *evil Surmizings*, as if I *ranked with Devils those who differ from me in these Points*. For my part, I judge no Man as to his final State, nor attempt to set at nought my Brother, knowing we are all to appear before a Tribunal, where God will be Judge himself. I censure not, but hope the best of those who differ from me, even in Points which seem to be of dangerous Tendency, and doubt not of God's favourable regard to such as bear a sincere Love to Truth and Goodness. We had need however to pass the time of our sojourning here in Fear, and carefully guard against Errors in Doctrine and Practice, which may expose to his Censure and Resentment.

WHAT had been offer'd in Defence of the Deity of Christ, I thought provided against that which he subjoined about the Holy Ghost, which he now calls *Evidences of his Subordination or Inferiority*. What he means by this, he is not pleased to tell us, or in what Rank of Being he places him, or what sort of Creature he makes him, since he seems unwilling to allow him so much as the Name of God, which he freely allows to other Creatures as God's Agents. He observes, that in the *Stile of the Scriptures, the Spirit is represented as God's Agent, and God is set out as working by him*. And will God's working by his Spirit necessarily argue, that he is therefore but an inferior Agent? A Man may be said to work by his Will, without supposing that his Will is therefore an inferior Agent. God made the World by Jesus Christ, yet he appears not to be such an inferior Agent, of whom 'tis said, *And thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Work of thine hands*. \* The Scripture tells us, that *the Spirit searches all things, yea even the deep things of God*:

---

\* Heb. i. 10.

X which is no more a Mark of an inferior Agent, than of the Spirit of Man which is in him, being such, which differs not really from the Man \*. It seems also to ascribe Sovereignty to him in his Working; *All these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every Man severally as he will* †. He adds, *So that it cannot seem strange, that that is said to be done to God, which is done more immediately to the Spirit. This is a full Answer to the Proof brought from Acts v. 3, 4. Ananias lyed immediately to the Apostles, and by lying to them, he did, in effect, lye to the Holy Ghost, who dwelt in them; and this was again in effect, a lying to God, who sent the Holy Spirit.* But as God the Father appears not here to be mentioned, or the Spirit's being his inferior Agent: so 'tis unto the Holy Ghost that the Lye was made, the Holy Ghost that herein was tempted; *ver. 9. and he is set in opposition to the Apostles, whom he thought to have deceived; Thou hast not lyed unto Men, but unto God*: Whereas, according to our Author, it should have been said, *thou hast not lyed unto Men, nor unto the Holy Ghost in us, but unto God, both the Holy Ghost and the Apostles being God's Agents.* But the Text is so far from asserting or countenancing this, that it says the contrary, *Why hath Satan filled thine Heart to lye to the Holy Ghost?* He goes on; *Thus, 1 Thes. iv. 8. He that despiseth, despiseth not Man, but God, who hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit*; compare *Luke x. 16.* But this is so far from invalidating, that it rather confirms our Sense. God or Christ is here set in opposition to Man; the Contempt and Indignity did not so properly respect and affect the latter, as the Person and Authority of the former, in whose Name, and by whose Order, the Apostles acted. In like manner, it was not so properly to the Apostles, that *Ananias lyed*, as unto the Holy Ghost, by whom they were empower'd,

---

\* 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.      † 1 Cor. xii. 11.



and who knew the Secrets of his Heart, which he had thought to conceal ; hereby shewing that he was God, unto whom he lyed. N. 13

THIS, says he, *likewise answers his Argument from 1 Cor. iii. 16. Know ye not that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? The reason is plain, viz. because Christians are an Habitation of God thro the Spirit.* As if God's dwelling in us by his Spirit, were inconsistent with the Holy Spirit's dwelling in us himself as his own Temple, and in his own immediate Right, to whom and to whose Service we are consecrated jointly with the Father. *Mat. xxviii. 19. 1 Cor. vi. 19. What, know ye not that your Body is the Temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you?*

I observed, that Divine Perfections are acknowledged in him. He is called, *The eternal Spirit* \*. 'Tis doubtful, says our Author, *whether the Holy Spirit or the Logos is meant.* I deny not but the Divine Nature in Christ may be intended, tho it seems probable to be spoken of the Holy Spirit, by whom the human Nature was anointed, sanctified, and prepared to be a Sacrifice ; especially according to his Notion, which supposes the *Logos* himself, having no superior Nature, to be in such Anguish and Distress, as to need not only the Assistance of the Spirit, but of the Angels in the Oblation that was made.

THE Spirit of God was with him in the beginning, when he laid the Foundation of the Earth †. He is represented as every where present ‖. Nor does the *Elegancy of the Description made of the Divine Omnipresence*, prejudice the Truth of the Account, or make it necessary or probable, that by a needless and uncouth Figure, the Spirit of God, and his *Presence or Face*, should signify the same thing, when

---

\* Heb. ix. 14.    † Gen. i. 2.    ‖ Psal. cxxxix. 7.

both are distinctly mentioned ; and if he be there spoken of at all, I see not but he must be spoken of as a distinct Person. Nor can it be well imagin'd how he should dwell in all Believers \*, and abide as a Comforter † in all Cases and Circumstances for ever, but upon this Supposition.

As for his absolute Knowledge, and his being intimately acquainted with all the Father's Counsels, our Author thinks it sufficient to refer to the Letter, p. 16, 17. where 'tis shown that this Knowledge is communicated to him, from Joh. xvi. 13, 14, 15. *He shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, &c.* As if we deny'd that the Holy Spirit, by Dispensation and Office in the Affairs of Grace, acted in Subordination to the Father and Son, and by way of Communication from them, according to antient Counsel and Agreement. Thus to his Query ||, *If the Holy Ghost were the supreme God, can it be thought, that his not speaking of himself, but what he shall hear, should be the Reason and Evidence of his leading the Disciples into all Truth?* I answer; Yes, very well, according to the Nature and Design of his distinct Character and Office. But it is a different thing, and it would have been to his purpose, to shew, that the Spirit had no Knowledge, and no way of knowing, but by arbitrary Communication. The Scripture seems to give quite another account of it, and to assure us of his Ability fully to instruct us in the things of God, not merely because he has been himself instructed, but because he searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God, (yet who, or what finite Being, by searching can find out God? Job xi. 7, 8, 9.) *For as no Man knoweth the things of a Man, save the Spirit of Man which is in him; even so, the things of God knoweth none, but the Spirit of God\*\*.*

\* Rom. viii. 11. † Joh. xiv. 16. || P. 89.

\*\* 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.



Now the Spirit of Man is intimately conscious of the things of a Man, and needs not to receive this Knowledge from another. And who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his Counsellor, hath taught him? With whom took he Counsel? Who instructed him, and taught him Knowledge? *Isa. xl. 13, 14.*

I went on to shew, that the Works which the Scriptures ascribe to him, are no less than Divine, such undoubted Effects of Omnipotence, as speak him to be true God; so as that even the *Socinians*, who do not think fit to allow that he is a Divine Person, do yet find themselves obliged to attribute those Works to Almighty Power: However, as I shewed that the Holy Scriptures manifestly speak of him as a Person; so I find not our Author to make doubt of this.

I concluded, upon the Evidence of such like Texts and Considerations as had been urged, the Reasonableness and Necessity of supposing, that Deity does also properly belong to the Holy Ghost, tho it was that of our Lord Jesus, which I had especially undertaken the Defence of; nor will the appearance of some Difficulty justify an Attempt to baffle certain Revelation, in a Subject confess'd to be above the reach of our limited and very narrow Understanding; or warrant precarious Schemes, that intrench upon his Honour and Prerogative, to whom we have the most absolute and inviolable Obligations.

WHEREAS 'twas urged, that the Texts which are plain for a Subordination or Inferiority (in the Son) will not admit of an Evasion here; since it cannot be reply'd, that the Holy Ghost is Man or Mediator: I thought it no Absurdity to speak of the Divine Persons which the Scriptures mention, and make known to us, according to that Revelation, and suppose that there is a certain Order among them, or a sort of Subordination in working, without one Person's being inferior to



to another in Essence and Perfection. And his saying that I *alledge the contested Position as an Answer*, can signify nothing with such as consider, that I had before accounted for it, and clear'd up the Difficulties about it; and it was sufficient for me, in answer to his present Argument, to shew, that it was of no force to invalidate and overthrow our Position, or to prove it to be impossible or unreasonable; which was all I had occasion here to do.

As for his repeating so often *that the Scripture never says, that these three are the one God; and how can it be conceived, that this one Essence or Nature should constitute more than one Person, or one Agent? &c.* It has had a distinct Consideration, and I cannot but esteem the Answers that were made to be full and sufficient, of which the Prudent and Impartial will judge. The Scriptures do abundantly assure us, that there is but one God, that his Nature or Essence is but one, that the Lord our God alone is to be served and worship'd, that Father, Son, and Spirit, are each truly possess'd of proper Divine Characters and Perfections, and each truly entitled to our Religious Homage. In this Revelation we acquiesce, without being curiously wise above what is written, or in doubt about the necessary and unavoidable Consequence. The Great God best knows himself, and can alone tell us what he is.

HE farther argued, that the Father is said to *send and give the Holy Ghost, and Christ the Mediator to receive and send him, upon his Prayer to his Father, that a Person must be suppos'd to have an Authority over one whom he gives or sends; adding, Mr. Moore is very slight in his Answer, viz.* And what Absurdity in supposing, that this may be done even among Equals by Consent and Agreement, without any antecedent proper Superiority? But as slight as he would have it to be thought, I find not that he does disprove it, or shew any real Absurdity in it, in the Harangue he

he thinks for his purpose to address to his Reader upon it. Nor is there the least reason to conclude, that if *the Coming of the Holy Ghost* was by *the Will of the Father*, it was not by *his own Consent and Agreement*; when the one may so well and fairly consist with the other, and a joint Concurrence must certainly be allow'd.

He asks, *What reason can there be to think, that a Person who is supreme God, can subject himself to another, and become a subordinate Person, not only to the Father, but to Christ the Mediator.* I answer, We say not that the Holy Ghost is *supreme*, if hereby is meant, *first*, among the Divine Persons, tho we suppose that he has a joint Supremacy with the other Persons, in respect of Godhead; nor do we say, that he is become a *subordinate Person* to Christ as Mediator, tho he act in an Office, in some sense, subordinate. And why should it be thought absurd or unreasonable, that the Holy Spirit, secure of his own Greatness, for valuable and most glorious Ends, in the Recovery and Salvation of lapsed Man, distinctly to commend his Love and display his Goodness, should be content to take an Office and Character, wherein he might act in Concurrence with, and in some sort of Subordination to the Father and Son? Why should it be thought incredible, tho it be very astonishing, that the Divine Word should be incarnate and become Man, and act in the subordinate Office of a Mediator, without Disparagement or Diminution of his original Glory and Perfection? Should we not rather account, and gratefully acknowledge, this surprising Condescension and Benignity, to be most truly divine, to be a real Manifestation of the truest Glory? What can more directly tend to give an affecting Sense, and just Estimate of the transcendent Goodness and peculiar Excellency of that God, who is Love? What more becoming him, and more congruous to his Design, that he might appear amiable

T

to



to us, who had offended him, were prejudiced against him, and under a dread of his Resentment? What more likely Method to win and ravish our Hearts, and engage our best Affections for himself and Service, under the most endearing Obligations? I cannot but think with the excellent Dr. Tillotson, ' That tho it was a strange Condescension, yet it ' was likewise a most wonderful Argument of his ' Goodness, (the greatest Instance of the truest ' Goodness that ever was) which is the highest Glory of the Divine Nature. If God for our sakes ' did submit himself to a Condition, which we may ' think did less become him, here is great cause of ' Thankfulness, but none sure of Cavil or Exception. We have infinite reason to acknowledge and ' admire his Goodness, but none at all to upbraid ' him with his Kindness, and to quarrel with him ' for having descended so much beneath himself, to ' testify his Love to us, and his tender Concernment ' for our Happiness. Besides that, when we have ' said all we can about this Matter, I hope we will ' allow God himself to be the best and most competent Judge, what is fit for God to do, and that he ' needs not to take Counsel of his Creatures, what ' will best become him in this or any other Case. ' *Behold in this thou art not just; I will answer thee, that ' God is greater than Man: why dost thou dispute against ' him? for he giveth not account of any of his Matters.* ' Job xxxiii. 12, 13 \*.

I have thus, thro the Goodness of God, review'd the Argument relating to the Deity of Christ, willing to weigh with Calmness the Objections made, or farther urged against it, without omitting any thing, to my knowledge, that merited further Consideration :

---

\* Tillotson's Works, Fol. p. 556.



And must confess myself but more confirm'd in the Truth and Reasons of that Doctrine, which has been generally received in the Churches of Christ, without laying stress upon nicer Speculations, or Scholastick Niceties, foreign to the Scripture-Revelation, design'd for the Use and Benefit, not the Perplexing of Mankind. Nor need we wonder at all, if some things in Religion are hard to be understood, and of difficult Explication, which yet as to their Being and Existence are of necessary Belief; when even most of the things before us, that we familiarly converse with, puzzle our enquiring Thought, and admit not clear and certain Explication, tho we doubt not of the Truth and Reality of their Existence, and find we have sufficient knowledge of them, for the Conduct and Commerce of human Life.

OUR Author may be willing to pass his Scheme upon the Reader, under the plausible Notion of *Plain Christianity*; but upon maturer Examination, it seems to me, as it hath still done to the wiser and far greater part of Christians, contrary to Holy Scripture, and the Religion it was design'd to establish, unreasonable in itself, and clogg'd with shocking and insuperable Difficulties. And tho I believe not this Gentleman to be inclined to Deism; yet if such a Way of Arguing, and such a Method of Interpretation, be freely indulged, as some do not scruple in the present Controversy, it may not be hard to guess what use will be made of it, by such as are prejudiced against the Christian Religion, and appear in a Disposition to part with it upon easy Terms.

It is however, I think, to be gloried in, as a Divine and most Excellent Institution, admirably adapted in all the Parts of it, to serve and answer the proper Ends of Religion, approving itself to the Reason of Mankind, amidst some appearing Difficulties, and very rational even in those things that are peculiar to it, and of mere Revelation. And I am not without hope,

hope, that what has unhappily occasioned some Diffractions of late, that tend to the Disadvantage of Religion, may yet, under the Conduct of a wise Providence, have this good Effect, to put Christians upon a more diligent searching of the Scriptures, that they may better understand, and be better establish'd in the Belief and Practice of the Religion they profess. It seems indeed owing to the Decay of this, and the Levity of its Professors, that Opinions sometimes heretofore advanc'd with Warmth and Subtilty, and as often condemned, and discarded as dangerous Errors, have been of late again reviv'd, and so far entertain'd: I heartily wish they may not prove an Engine to subvert and ruin the Remainders thereof. And unless they had a greater and more manifest Tendency to make Men more holy and heavenly in their Conversations, than the common Belief, under the Influence of which, cordially receiv'd, the Life of Godliness has so happily flourish'd, what occasion for so much Heat and Eagerness? or what reason to give the World, or the Church, so much Trouble and Disturbance about them? Loose Opinions, however plausible in their first Appearance, commonly end in loose and evil Practices. If we once lose our Faith, we shall not long maintain Good Works. I am,

S I R,

Your Humble Servant:

10 JA 66

F I N I S.

f  
t  
d  
s  
y  
s  
r  
n  
f.  
t  
n  
r  
e  
n  
o  
d  
r  
n  
y